Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-187
Wednesday
26 September 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-187 *26 September 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

TASS Assesses Obstacles at Vienna Arms Talks 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Continues Working at UN Session 2
Addresses Assembly 25 Sep *[TASS]* 2
Chairs Security Council Meeting *[TASS]* 7
Meets French, Cypriot Ministers *[Moscow Radio]* 8
Yakovlev Travels to Paris for Forum on Germany 8
Meets With France's Fabius *[Moscow TV]* 8
Confers With EC Chairman *[TASS]* 8
Delegates Head to European Parliamentary Meeting *[TASS]* 9
North Atlantic Assembly Delegates Visit Ukraine *[IZVESTIYA 16 Sep]* 9
German Plan for New Helicopter Questioned *[IZVESTIYA 19 Sep]* 9

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Kazakh Leaders Meet U.S. Businessmen *[TASS]* 10
Bush Speaks to Arab-American Group on Gulf *[TASS]* 10
U.S. Decision To Cut Foreign Bases Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Sep]* 10
Russia Signs Cigarette Deal With U.S. Company *[IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]* 11

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Greets Japanese Politicians on Culture Week 11
Holds Meeting 25 Sep *[TASS]* 11
Seeks Better Ties *[Tokyo KYODO]* 11
Lukyanov Addresses Ceremony *[Moscow International]* 12
Japanese Parliamentarian Speaks *[Moscow International]* 12
'Deletion' in Japan's New Defense White Paper Eyed *[Moscow International]* 13

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Meets Singapore Prime Minister *[TASS]* 14
New Ambassador to Vietnam Presents Credentials *[TASS]* 14

Near East & South Asia

Jordanian Crown Prince Interviewed on Gulf *[TRUD 26 Sep]* 15
Saudi Pilgrimage Minister Ends Moscow Visit *[Riyadh SPA]* 16
Syrian Leader's Visit to Tehran Assessed *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 17
Persian Gulf Crisis Causes Oil Price Spiral *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 17
Soviet Veterans' Trip to Afghanistan Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 18

West Europe

Swedish Defense Minister Visits Military Sites *[TASS]* 18
Ryzhkov Receives Swedish Industrialist *[TASS]* 19
Yeltsin Cancels Planned Trip to Italy *[Rome ANSA]* 19

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Deputies To Discuss New Union Treaty 25 Sep *[TASS]* 20
Supreme Soviet 25 Sep Session Detailed *[Moscow TV]* 20
Gorbachev Proposes New Name for Soviet Union *[Moscow TV]* 20
Union Treaty Discussion Leads to 'Heated' Debate *[TASS]* 21
Nationalities Chairman Speaks on Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 21
Solzhenitsyn Article Receives 'Hostile Reception' *[TASS]* 24
Gorbachev Criticizes Solzhenitsyn's Political Views *[Moscow TV]* 25
Gorbachev Aide Views Need for 'Emergency' Powers *[Moscow Radio]* 26
Economic Decrees Already Prepared *[TASS]* 26
President's Additional Powers Detailed *[Moscow TV]* 27
Deputies View Gorbachev, Government Programs *[Moscow Radio]* 27
Shatalin Presents Draft Economic Decision 24 Sep *[Moscow Radio]* 28

Political & Social

Gorbachev Greets All-Union Pioneer Rally *[Moscow Radio]* 29
Ignatenko Holds Briefing on Gorbachev's Agenda *[TASS]* 29
Adviser Petrakov Reviews Gorbachev's New Powers *[AFP]* 30
Deputy Golik Comments on Presidential Powers *[Moscow TV]* 30
Deputies 'Fail to Understand' Rival Programs *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 31
Revenko Answers Questions About Union Treaty *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 20 Sep]* 32
Solzhenitsyn Publishes Essay in Moscow Weekly *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 38]* 37
Medical Industry Minister Explains Shortages *[IZVESTIYA 16 Sep]* 58
Work of Interagency 'Secrets' Panel Cited *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 60
Internal Troops Depoliticization 'Exaggerated' *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 62
Marxist Workers Party Holds Second Congress *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 21 Sep]* 62
'Radical-Democratic' Bloc Forming in Moscow *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 62
All-Union Jewish Cultural Association Formed *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 62
Call for End to GOSR Celebrations Decried *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Sep]* 63
Metallurgists Stage Union Congress in Moscow *[Moscow TV]* 63
Collectives' Property Rights To Be Upheld *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 63
Official Discusses State of Soviet Psychiatry *[Moscow Radio]* 64
Moscow Demonstrators Call for Detainee's Release *[Moscow TV]* 64
Papers Likely To Revise Publication Patterns *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Sep]* 65

Economic

Economists Comment on Market Plan Delay *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 65
French Firm Signs Oil Development Agreement *[TASS]* 67

Military

More Details of Troop Movements Near Moscow *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 67
Parliamentarians Warned of Moscow Troop Buildup *[AFP]* 68
Lieutenant General Rejects Coup Speculation *[Zagreb DANAS 18 Sep]* 69

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Coverage of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Sessions 71
25 Sep Agenda *[Vilnius Radio]* 71
Landsbergis Addresses Session *[Vilnius Radio]* 71
Plans to Resettle Soviet Germans *[Warsaw PAP]* 73
UN Advice on Minorities Requested *[TASS]* 73
Political Party Law Adopted *[Vilnius International]* 73
Lithuanian Official Comments on Nishanov Report *[Vilnius Radio]* 74
Lithuanian Official Views Alternate Army Call-Up *[Vilnius International]* 74
'Leftist Faction' Established in Lithuanian Parliament *[Vilnius International]* 74
European Parliament Group Visits Lithuania *[TASS]* 74
Lithuanian Government Adopts Various Resolutions *[Vilnius Radio]* 75
Lithuanian Radio's Second Channel Reorganized *[Vilnius International]* 75
Latvian Supreme Soviet Denounces Anti-Semitism *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Sep]* 75
Latvian Militia To Guard Moscow Delegation *[Riga Radio]* 76
New Baltic Newspaper To Be Published *[SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH 21 Aug]* 76

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings Detailed 76
Local Government Law Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 76
'500 Days' Legal Framework Formed *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Health Minister Appointed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Sep]* 77
Resolution on Chernobyl Committee *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Sep]* 77
Resolution on 'Sciences' Decision *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Sep]* 77
Resolution on Soviet Newspapers *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Sep]* 77
Constituent Congress Adopts 'Anti-Market' Mood *[IZVESTIYA 15 Sep]* 78
Yeltsin Discusses Economy, Gorbachev's 'Mistake' *[TASS]* 82
Finance Minister Discusses Price Issues *[Moscow TV]* 82
Baklanov Visits 'Tense' Sverdlovsk Oblast *[PRAVDA 21 Sep]* 83
Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk Said To Be in 'Hazardous State' *[Moscow TV]* 83
Changes in Tatar Republic Press Reported *[IZVESTIYA 22 Sep]* 84

Western Republics

Belorussian Official Views Republic Independence *[BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA No 33]* 84
Belorussian Investigators Will Not Visit Osh *[Moscow Radio]* 85
Moldavia Democrats Urge Rejection of Separatists *[TASS]* 85
Ukrainians Demand 'Order' Against Rising Prices *[IZVESTIYA 21 Sep]* 86
Ukrainian Union Supports 27 Sep Strike Plans *[TASS]* 86
Ukrainian Official Discusses Party, Independence *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 38]* 86
Crimean Soviet Urges Urge 'Return' of Tatars *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Sep]* 87
Chernigov Bans 'Destabilizing' Political Acts *[Kiev International]* 88
Ukraine 'People's Party' Holds Founding Congress *[Kiev International]* 88

Caucasus

Party Advocates 'Independent,' 'United' Armenia *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Movsisyan Addresses Armenian Party Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 89
Future Shape, Role of Armenian Party Asserted *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* 89
Armenian Villages Calm Despite Azeri Threat *[Yerevan International]* 89
24-Hour Strike Takes Place in Nagorno-Karabakh *[TASS]* 90
Azeri Trade Unions Abolish NKAO Council *[Yerevan Radio]* 90
Baku Non-Residents Ordered Out of City *[TRUD 26 Sep]* 90

Central Asia

Kazakhstan Leader Discusses 'Alarming Trends' *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 90
Homemade Bomb Explodes at School in Alma-Ata *[TASS]* 91
Kirghizia, Armenia Sign Cooperation Agreement *[Frunze Radio]* 91

TASS Assesses Obstacles at Vienna Arms Talks

LD2509200890 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—Chief U.S. negotiator at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe, James Woolsey, speaking about the state of affairs at the talks, was pessimistic about the possibility of completing the formulation of the first agreement by November 19, 1990, that is by the beginning of the Paris CSCE summit, where the document is planned to be signed.

Meanwhile, a spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry, speaking at a briefing, expressed hope that the Vienna agreement will be finished on schedule and will objectively reflect the military and political situation in Europe.

What is it that hampers the negotiations? Agreement has not yet been reached on such questions as the reduction of shore-based naval aviation, arms control, distribution of armaments among the 16 NATO member-countries and the seven Warsaw Treaty member-countries. There is another important problem: The West believes that not a single country participating in the agreement should possess more than 30 per cent of the armaments of the entire alliance, while the Soviet Union believes that the limit should be set at 40 per cent.

Without doubt, the situation necessitates the speeding up of work at negotiations. The time has come when each participant in the forum should seriously analyse its stand and decide if the solution of some disputed questions could be put off until the next stage of the talks. For instance, the Western side should consider if the problem of reducing ship-based naval aviation would be more expedient to decide at the next stage, combined with reduction of carrier-borne aviation.

Perhaps, the problem of the division of armaments among member states in the alliances following arms reduction should not be treated in the first agreement. This problem could better be resolved within their military-political alliances in the process of arms reduction. The situation in East European countries is extremely dynamic and has not yet stabilized everywhere.

And, finally, the question of a 30 or 40 per cent limit to arms in one country should be considered by the West on the basis of political realism, taking into consideration the changes taking place in the armed forces of the East European countries.

Western representatives must surely be aware of the amounts of armed forces and armaments reductions unilaterally made by these countries. It might happen that if the 30 per cent limit is set in the armaments of a separate country, the Warsaw Treaty organisation will be unable to muster the total arms quotas assigned for it, since the Soviet Union has so far been bearing the main burden for ensuring the alliance's defences.

One would like to hope that the forthcoming meetings of foreign ministers of NATO and Warsaw Treaty countries in New York will find solutions to problems that still hamper the successful conclusion of the negotiations in Vienna.

Shevardnadze Continues Working at UN Session

Addresses Assembly 25 Sep

LD2509190690 Moscow TASS in English 1808 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] United Nations September 25 TASS—Follows the full text of the speech by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze at the 45th U.N. General Assembly session on September 25.

Mr. President,
Distinguished delegates,
Ladies and gentlemen.

From the vantage point of this forty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly one might look back in amazement at how strikingly different is the terrain we have covered in just one year from the familiar landscape of the preceding four decades.

Politically, this was not just a calendar year but a light year in the history of the world.

The cold war, with its accompanying stress, psychoses and anticipation of disaster, is no longer a part of our life. Gone is the strain of daily confrontation, propaganda bickering and reciprocal threats.

This was the year during which pieces of the Berlin Wall were a popular souvenir. And now, an end has been put to the division of Europe and a final line drawn under the Second World War. The unification of the two German states is being completed. The "German question", this "great" and "classical" problem of world politics which only yesterday seemed intractable, has been resolved calmly and to mutual satisfaction.

Let me congratulate cordially and sincerely the German people on behalf of the Soviet people on this most important event in the history of this state, this nation and Europe.

Almost unnoticed, the military alliances have lost their enemies. They are beginning to build their relations on a new basis, moving away from confrontation which is being eroded by disarmament, lower defence spending, more wide-ranging confidence-building measures and the emergence of collective and cooperative security structures.

Unprecedented progress has been made in the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts by political means. In southern Africa the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia has been implemented. The situation around Nicaragua has been settled, and a dynamic search for peace is under way in Cambodia, Afghanistan and other hot spots of the globe. We do not forget about Angola, Ethiopia, Cyprus, Korean peninsula and Western Sahara. All this is being done with the most active participation of the United Nations.

These positive changes in the world have been propelled by a new relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States, which is evolving from cooperation to partnership and interaction. The meetings of the Soviet and U.S. presidents on Malta, in Camp David and Helsinki and major events in world politics.

The political environment is clearly being defined by the global recognition of the supremacy of universal human values. Democratic forms are becoming established in running the affairs of states and in the conduct of international affairs.

The United Nations too is being reborn. We are pleased to note that President Mikhail Gorbachev's ideas concerning the role of the organization in the changing world have been seen to reflect majority opinion and the real needs of the international community.

The central concepts of today's politics are cooperation, interaction and partnership in facing the global challenges of combatting economic backwardness, poverty and social inequality and protecting the environment.

Had this session taken place before last August, we would have had every reason to say that mankind had cleared a narrow and dangerous passage and had wide and glowing horizons ahead of it.

But now our field of vision has been obscured by the dark cloud of aggression against Kuwait. On that black Thursday Iraq flagrantly violated the United Nations Charter, the principles of international law, the universally recognised norms of morality and the standards of civilized behaviour. Iraq has committed an unprovoked aggression, annexed a neighbouring sovereign state, seized thousands of hostages and resorted to unprecedented blackmail, threatening to use weapons of mass destruction.

There is also another dimension to Iraq's action. It has dealt a blow to all that mankind has recently achieved, all that we have been able to accomplish together, by adopting the new political thinking as our guide to the future.

An act of terrorism has been perpetrated against the emerging new world order. This is a major affront to mankind. Unless we find a way to respond to it and cope with the situation, our civilisation will be thrown back by half a century.

The Security Council reacted rapidly and with determination, as required by the nature and dimensions of the threat. There is no doubt that it expressed the will of the international community.

Iraqi actions are having and will have the gravest consequences for the people of Iraq and for millions of men, women and children in many countries of the world, for their hopes and their future. War may break out in the Gulf region any day, any moment.

From this rostrum we would like to appeal once again to the leaders of Iraq. We are doing it as their old friends and as a country that found the courage to condemn its wrongdoings against certain states in the past. We call upon them to hear reason, to obey the demands of the

law and also of plain common sense, to take a responsible and humane attitude, above all vis-a-vis the Iraqi people, who surely yearn for peace, tranquility and good relations with their neighbours.

We also hope that at this time of grave trial Arab states will live up to the expectations of mankind and help to find a way out of the Persian Gulf crisis. This would make it possible to deal with other hotbeds of conflict in the Middle East, and to find an equitable solution to the Palestinian problem.

If the world has survived to this day it is because at tragic moments in its history the forces of evil were always opposed by the forces of good, arbitrary power by the rule of law, treachery and meanness by honour and decency, and violence by the strength of the spirit and the belief in justice.

Today is no time for rejoicing, but one cannot help being satisfied at the unprecedented unity of the Security Council and the clear attitude of the international public opinion in the face of Iraq's behaviour. This gives us confidence in the ability of the United Nations to deal with this grave international crisis. The positions taken by members of this organisation give the Security Council the mandate to go as far as the interests of world peace will require.

Some may find that Iraq is being judged by a different higher standard than that applied to other countries even in quite recent past. My answer is this: It is good that we have reached this point. It is good that we have adopted a universal human yardstick of good and evil; that we are calling aggression by its proper name and consider it necessary to condemn and punish its perpetrator and to help the victim of injustice.

These days are a trying time, a test for our organisation. If it passes this test it will immeasurably enhance its prestige, gain new experience and new capabilities. There is no doubt that it will use them to restore peace and justice in other conflict situations and to ensure the implementation of its resolutions bearing on all regional problems.

An approach based on mankind's common interest does not permit any other kind of behaviour. From now on the world community intends to act by a common set of standards.

International relations are being freed from the vestiges of the cold war which for years had a negative effect on the international legal order. We are again becoming the United Nations and are returning to our own global constitution—the Charter of the United Nations, to those of its provisions that were forgotten for a while but have been proven to be indispensable for the most important of our tasks—the maintenance of international peace and security. The establishment of the principles of new thinking in world politics has enabled us to start implementing the effective measures of persuasion and enforcement provided in the charter.

In the context of recent events we should remind those who regard aggression as an acceptable form of behaviour that the United Nations has the power to "suppress acts of aggression." There is ample evidence that this right can be exercised. It will be, if the illegal occupation of Kuwait continues. There is enough unity in this regard in the Security Council, and there is also the will and a high degree of consensus in the world community.

Of course, before—and I reiterate—before this all political, peaceful, non-military forms of pressure must be applied to the aggressor, obviously in combination with economic and other enforcement measures.

In a way, the Gulf crisis is not just a tragedy and an extremely dangerous threat to peace; it is also a serious challenge for all of us to renew the ways and means of maintaining security, the methods of protecting law and order on our planet, the mechanisms for controlling the processes which affect the state of human civilisation in the broadest meaning of this term, and the role of the United Nations in this.

As any other democratically operating organisation, the United Nations can function effectively if it has a mandate from its members, if states agree on a voluntary and temporary basis to delegate to it a portion of their sovereign rights and to entrust it with performing certain tasks in the interests of the majority.

It cannot be otherwise in today's world. Only in this way can we make the period of peace lasting and irreversible and follow up on our initial success in bringing about a healthier climate in international relations.

Life poses new challenges. What will be needed in the first place is, in our view, a theoretical and conceptual reassessment of the political, technological, economic, environmental, humanitarian and cultural realities of the modern world and of its human dimension. The world is consolidating on the basis of universal human values. Partnership is replacing rivalry. It is becoming the basis for relations between many countries that used to regard each other as adversaries.

Partnership is not just a fashionable term. It came in evidence during the latest crisis and underlied the close and constructive interaction among the permanent members of the Security Council. But the decline of East-West rivalry as a real or perceived factor in international relations may bring to the arena of world politics new figures and new phenomena. One such phenomenon we will probably have to deal with is claims to regional hegemony.

Among the issues assuming a critical importance for the future of mankind are the non-proliferation of nuclear, chemical, bacteriological and missile technologies and, more generally, and disproportionate growth of the military sector in some economies and societies.

Even in the past the doctrines of the "balance of terror" and "nuclear deterrence" were questionable means of

maintaining peace and security. In the new conditions they simply become irrelevant.

We need to define the criteria of defense sufficiency. The Iraqi aggression would seem to make it difficult even to discuss this. After all, what can be sufficient in the face of the irrational? On the other hand, the aggression has once again underscored the validity of the argument that no nation should have the exclusive prerogative or absolute freedom to determine its own level of armament. Any other approach would result in an unbridled arms race and all-out militarisation. We must look toward different principles, toward an accommodation of reciprocal concerns and a balance of armaments at the lowest possible levels.

We in the Soviet Union have the unfortunate experience of building up a redundant defense capability. This was due more to an erroneous assessment of the situation and a desire to protect the country against any eventuality than at any evil intent or aggressiveness. At the time, we and our adversaries took an overly "arithmetical" approach to military parity. Of course, parity is needed for global stability, but it should not go beyond the limits of reasonable defense sufficiency.

We have drawn and continue to draw appropriate conclusions for ourselves. Is is now common knowledge that militarisation is wasteful for any country and can be ruinous when taken to extremes.

In the longer term, the world community will need to monitor the military power of states, arms supplies and transfers of military technology. Such an approach will be in everyone's interests and will strengthen stability and trust. Otherwise, we will continue to be confronted with armed conflicts and attempts to intimidate and blackmail. Above all it will be necessary to keep a close watch on those countries that make determined efforts to build up the offensive capabilities of their armed forces. Moreover, to have them explain why this is being done.

Of course, the United Nations itself will have to play the primary role in this. But the organisation will need effective support from regional security structures which are already becoming a reality in Europe and which we hope will emerge in Asia and the Pacific, in the Middle East, in Central America and elsewhere in the world.

We might consider the idea of introducing on a global and regional level the international registration of certain types of armaments that are produced or acquired. There is a need for transparency in this area.

We need to agree on principles governing the sale and supply of arms. Such attempts were made in the past, but unfortunately they were not carried through.

In our view, we must urgently request the Geneva conference on disarmament to address this issue and submit recommendations to the next session of the General Assembly.

Two years ago the Soviet delegation raised the issue of reactivating the work of the Security Council's Military Staff Committee. Recent developments have convinced us of the need to return to the original idea conceived by the founders of this organisation and of its charter.

We know why the Military Staff Committee has never become a functioning body. During the cold war the committee could not and did not have a role to play. Now, however, we see that without substantive recommendations from this body the Security Council is unable to carry out its functions under the charter.

The architects of our organisation proceeded from the harsh realities of the Second World War and were right in assuming that for the organisation to be effective in keeping peace and preventing war, it must have the means to enforce its decisions and, if necessary, to suppress aggression, and have mechanism for preparing and coordinating such actions.

The Soviet delegation believes that the Security Council must take the necessary organisational steps to be able to act in strict conformity with the provisions of the charter.

It should begin by initiating steps to reactivate the work of the Military Staff Committee and study the practical aspects of assigning national military contingents to serve under the authority of the council.

The Soviet Union is prepared to conclude an appropriate agreement with the Security Council. We are sure that the other permanent members of the council and states that might be approached by it will do the same.

If the Military Staff Committee worked properly, if appropriate agreements had been concluded between the council and its permanent members, and if other organisational aspects of countering threats to peace had been worked out, there would be no need now for individual states to act unilaterally. After all, however justified they might be, such actions provoke a mixed response, create problems for those same states and may not be acceptable to all.

By contrast, there is no reason to object to steps taken by legitimate international "law-enforcement bodies"—the Security Council and its Military Staff Committee.

We should not underestimate even the psychological effect of the Security Council acquiring structures and forces to counter aggression.

I would like to emphasise that the use of force is only possible as a last resort. We must rely on non-military, political means and pursue our objectives in a peaceful manner. Today more than ever before it is these methods that are becoming effective.

The latest crisis has dramatically illustrated the importance of preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

To be frank, the situation is beginning to cause alarm. Let us face it: Cracks have appeared in the nuclear nonproliferation regime; IAEA is having difficulty expanding the zone of application of its safeguards. It is time to

trigger off the emergency systems in order to save the situation. As a matter of utmost urgency, nuclear tests must be stopped. If testing is stopped, we have a chance to survive; otherwise the world will perish. We need to tell people about it frankly, without taking refuge in all sorts of specious arguments. Should we perhaps invite the parliaments of all countries to express their attitude to nuclear explosions?

What else has to happen to set in motion the elimination of chemical weapons? The Soviet Union and the United States are setting an example by doing so on a bilateral basis. But what about the others? It is really odd that while there is no person, no politician who would publicly call for retaining toxic agents things are at a standstill.

Should we perhaps ask for a roll-call vote right in this room to see who votes against? If everyone is in favour, let us just work out a binding schedule for completing work on the convention and set a timeframe for the destruction of chemical weapons. Similar problems, mostly concerning verification, arise with regard to biological weapons.

Swift action is needed on all these issues, yet the debate at the Geneva conference on disarmament proceeds in a quiet and leisurely manner. Should this be tolerated? Even as dangerous developments are gaining critical momentum in the world, the negotiations continue at a pace that was set at the time of the cold war.

I think negotiators at the Palais des Nations in Geneva should pull up the blinds. Let them see what is going on outside and let people know that what those disarmament pundits are reflecting upon.

I don't want to offend anyone. I know that eminent people work there. But what is to be done? The time has come to cry out.

I cannot fail to mention yet another aspect of security.

The world community should also consider the possibility of various "unconventional situations" arising from the mass taking of hostages and cases of blackmail involving particularly dangerous and destructive weapons.

These problems will have to be addressed at two levels—technical and legal. We could start out by setting up a group of experts for contingency planning under the Security Council.

The group could include experts on combatting terrorism, psychologists, nuclear physicists, chemists, physicians, disaster relief workers, experts on physical protection of facilities, etc.

Recommendations regarding the management of "unconventional situations" should be made known to a limited number of people. The Security Council may find it necessary upon recommendation of the Military Staff Committee to establish a rapid response force to be formed on a contract basis from units specially designated by different countries, including the five permanent members of the Security Council. This idea also deserves discussion.

But technical methods alone are not enough to deal with such things. In our view there is an urgent need to institute a new norm in international law which would declare the threat by any individual for purposes of blackmail of using weapons of mass destruction, hostage-taking or mass terror to be a crime against humanity. Such work is currently underway somewhere in the labyrinths of this organisation, but so far inconclusively.

What we need, however, is to create as soon as possible a moral and legal environment in which anyone guilty of grave crimes against humanity, of participating in atrocities, in taking hostages, acts of terrorism or torture, and those guilty of particular ruthlessness in the use of force, could not escape punishment and would not be absolved from personal responsibility even if they acted under orders.

The principle of suppressing aggression and threats to peace should, in our view, be complemented with the principle of individual responsibility and commensurate punishment.

This is a difficult question from the legal standpoint. An advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice should be sought on this subject. Incidentally, we would be in favour of enhancing the role of that body and would welcome a more up-to-date interpretation of its competence.

The Gulf crisis is causing a major dislocation in the entire system of world economy. Its true magnitude is even difficult to assess now. It is clear that the consequences will be severe for the economies of the developing countries particularly the poorest of them, those burdened by large foreign debt. Merely stating this is not enough. Action must be taken without delay. It is necessary to establish as soon as possible an international machinery, maybe a temporary one for the time being, for example under the auspices of the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank, to mitigate the negative consequences of this crisis for countries which are in a particularly vulnerable position.

We are of the view that sounding out the economic repercussions of the crisis should be primarily the function of the United Nations. The organisation should be the center of action in situations affecting the interests of many countries.

The Soviet Union as a major oil-producing and energy-exporting country will be prepared to cooperate in implementing measures under the auspices of the United Nations or of any other international body, aimed at stabilising the economic situation in the world. This should not be a matter of individual steps of a mostly charitable nature to assist individual countries. What is needed is a global policy of stabilisation and compensation.

History, particularly modern history, teaches all kinds of lessons. They should not be ignored or underestimated. One of them is that security can hardly be lasting unless it

is supported by economic growth combined with spiritual health and by traditional cultural values combined with new technologies and a concern for the environment.

Hence the need for cooperation in the 1990s to be geared to the resolution of the entire set of global economic and environmental problems. A new, "poverty curtain," this time between North and South, must not be allowed to fall. If it does, the division of the world that will follow may prove fatal to our civilisation. We have no time to lose. A global strategy for development and for solving universal problems is needed now. The United Nations, supported by its specialised agencies and by outside intellectual resources, should take the lead in formulating such a strategy.

An interdependent world calls for a new level of multilateral economic partnership. Cooperation on a bilateral basis and in selected areas is no longer enough.

The special session of the General Assembly on international economic cooperation has clearly shown that everybody would gain if each group of countries were to adjust its approaches and show willingness to forsake individual or group self-interest in economic cooperation, setting as its highest priority the interests of the common good, "a global self-interest" if you will, which would no longer be selfish.

We welcome the provisions of the declaration of the special session which support the integration of the USSR and East European countries into the world economy. We hope that the United Nations will give concrete expression to its support for this process.

The Soviet contribution to these efforts will certainly be growing as we move ahead with perestroyka at home, deepen our economic reform and switch over to a market economy. We have firmly opted for a closer association with GATT, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, with a view to joining them as soon as necessary internal and external conditions are in place.

We also see a unique contribution that we can make to the development of international cooperation. For geographical and other reasons we are in a better position than others to serve as a link between Europe and Asia and to contribute to the establishment of a single Eurasian space in the economic, scientific, technological, environmental and other areas. This could be facilitated, for instance, by Soviet communication lines and equipment, including space communication systems.

Scientific and technological progress has become a major factor shaping the world's future. The global nature of its implications places in a new perspective the need to coordinate national policies in this areas. The United Nations and its system or organisations can and must, in our view, assume a leading role in these efforts.

This is an area in which trust among states is of special importance. Without trust, barriers to international scientific and technological cooperation cannot be dismantled. We think that the international community should take a stand against monopolism in the field of science and technology. Without that, it will be difficult to deal effectively with underdevelopment and the numerous problems of the developing world.

If we succeeded in really focusing the global development strategy on scientific and technological progress, we could substantially mitigate such alarming trends as the brain drain, the growing professional migration, and the rising cost and narrowing scope of research.

The United Nations would do well to take the lead in organising a wide-ranging discussion on the role of thought, science and technology in addressing the problems of today's world. The USSR is ready to host such a discussion.

Much has been said lately on environmental issues. We even run the risk of "talking away" our future, for until now very little has been done at the global level while the destruction of the environment is outstripping our preparations to deal with the threat.

I hope that even as we continue to prepare for the 1992 conference on the environment and development in Brazil, we will be able to start implementing specific environmental projects.

In our view, one of the priority measures would be to establish a United Nations center for emergency environmental assistance. We have submitted to the secretary general a list of Soviet scientists and specialists whom, upon the center's request, we will be ready to send at our expense as part of international expert teams to areas of environmental disasters.

We are well aware that a healthy environment requires considerable investment both on the national and global levels. As we see it, the way to go is to reduce military expenditures and to promote conversion in the defense production sector. There is no alternative. The figures are well known. 800 billion dollars must be spent before the end of this century to avert environmental degradation. That sum is almost equal to what the world spends on the military each year.

The Chernobyl tragedy has highlighted the urgency of environmental protection problems.

We are grateful to the governments and various agencies which are joining in the hard work of dealing with the consequences of the disaster. On behalf of the Soviet people I also wish to express our gratitude to all international, governmental and public organisations and private citizens who have offered their help to the victims.

Our special thanks go the UNESCO and to those countries and organisations that reached out so movingly to Chernobyl's children, inviting them to come for rest and medical treatment and sharing with them the warmth of

their hearts. The secretary general's decision to designate a special representative for Chernobyl disaster relief has been greatly appreciated in our country.

The multidemensional approach to security supported by our organisation brings into focus the interrelationship between the security of states and the well-being and freedom of the individual. The human being is coming to the fore and the human dimension is becoming a universal yardstick for any international initiative. For us and for the United Nations the security of the individual, of every citizen and the protection of fundamental human rights are inseparable from the national security of states and international security as a whole.

I think the time has also come to look at regional conflicts from the standpoint of human rights. Those rights include the right to life and personal safety as well as the right to enjoy fundamental freedoms and to participate in the democratic process of government.

The main task for the international community is to create conditions in which people would be able to make a free choice. Disputes must be settled through the ballot box, not in the trenches of war.

Speaking about the future, we would also like to respond to those who are following with understandable concern the developments in our country. It is true that our domestic situation is not at all simple and still far from stable.

But, whatever the complexity of our situation, one has to see that it is evolving against the background of the emancipation, active political involvement and reaffirmation of their national identities by all of our country's nations. They are opening themselves to the world and the world is discovering them.

That this process is accompanied by certain difficulties and even losses should be no reason for excessive alarm, because the Soviet people and the democratic forces that are assuming responsibility for the future of our union are aware of the Soviet Union's place in the world and of its responsibility for the maintenance of global stability. This awareness is shared by all nations in our multinational country, and they will all act responsibly, realising that stability in the world will also mean peace in their own home.

In working for the renewal of our society we have seen how important it is to defend democratic principles at all levels, domestically and internationally.

If attempts to embark on the path of democracy were to end in failure or, worse still, in defeat, it would have grave consequences for the world's future, not to mention the risk of chaos and new dictatorships.

To prevent that should be in everyone's interest.

Today the humane goal formulated by Kant two centuries ago has special relevance for all of us: "The greatest challenge for the human race, which nature compels it to meet, is to attain a universal civic society based on the rule of law."

The key to this lies in strengthening the existing instruments of humanitarian cooperation, in the universal observance of international covenants on human rights and in the improvement of international humanitarian monitoring procedures.

As we meet for our organisation's 45th general assembly, we are speaking not so much of its maturity but of the beginning of its rebirth, its restoration according to the blueprints of 1945. And, wiping off the grime left by cold war, we see a work of collective wisdom. The United Nations devised their organisation as an instrument of action. We must see to it that from now on all of us gear our words to joint actions. This is what our time is all about. The philosophy of today is a philosophy of action.

This is the sixth time I speak from this rostrum and the sixth time I attend a session of the General Assembly. It has been a great, first-rate school.

Where else can one become so closely involved with the entire gamut of human problems and encounter such a constellation of personalities, intellectuals, professionals and scholars whose brilliant qualities are epitomised by the secretary general of our organisation, Mr. Perez de Cuellar.

I consider myself very fortunate to have met and worked here with real political leaders and great men during the years when the United Nations returned to what it was meant to be—a center for harmonising the activities of nations.

Chairs Security Council Meeting

LD2609014490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0035 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Nikolay Maslov, Yevgeniy Menkes, Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations, 26 Sep (TASS)—Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and the subsequent annexation of this state constitute a blatant trampling of the fundamental norms of international relations and the most important principles of UN rules, Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, has stated. A meeting of the UN Security Council [UNSC] at the foreign minister level devoted to the situation between Iraq and Kuwait opened here on Tuesday under the chairmanship of the Soviet minister.

Reflecting the demand of the entire world community, the minister continued, the UNSC adopted a decision on the unconditional restoration of the national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and legitimate authority of the state of Kuwait, and that the unconditional withdrawal of Iraq troops from Kuwait should be the first step in this direction, in keeping with the UNSC resolutions.

Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that no one should have any doubt about the steadfast course of the UNSC to resolutely oppose the fait accompli policy and the illegal actions of the Iraq authorities and Armed Forces in respect to the foreign citizens being held in Kuwait and in Iraq, the embassies in Kuwait and their staff, and Kuwaiti citizens and their property.

Faced with the stubborn refusal by Iraq to fulfill the decision of the UNSC, today's UNSC resolution, aimed at the strict observance of sanctions with respect to Iraq, is strictly in accordance with UN rules, and the norms of international law, the Soviet minister stressed. At the same time, the extension of the range of monitoring the full application of the sanctions instituted by the UNSC is regarded as the continuation of persistent efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

Eduard Shevardnadze noted that from the start of the crisis, the USSR has emphasized collective efforts founded on the full utilization of the rights and opportunities of the UN, and the need to resolve the crisis by nonmilitary, political, and diplomatic methods. This, stressed the minister, does not diminish the USSR's resolve to achieve an end to the aggression. If the measures being taken do not lead to this, then the USSR will be prepared to consider the possibility of additional steps in accordance with UN rules. We are convinced, the Soviet minister said in conclusion, that a de-escalation [deeskalatsiya] in the Persian Gulf and its political detente should lie at the heart of the joint efforts of the world community.

Meets French, Cypriot Ministers

LD2609101690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze met with French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas right after the UN Security Council session. The ministers discussed the situation currently developing in the Persian Gulf with emphasis on the necessity of further efforts for a political settlement. Discussion of bilateral relations was carried out in preparation for a visit to Paris by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

After that the USSR foreign minister met with Vasiliou, the president of Cyprus. He expressed hope that the international community—in particular, the Security Council—will be able to objectively concern itself with a solution to the Cyprus problem after the present acute crisis in the Persian Gulf area has been eased.

Yakovlev Travels to Paris for Forum on Germany

Meets With France's Fabius

LD2509212490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report on a meeting between Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council, and Laurent Fabius, president of the French National Assembly, by correspondent S. Yezvitov, at the USSR Embassy in Paris, date not given, from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] The international public forum "Germany and Europe" ended in Paris today.

[Begin recording] [Yezvitov] On the eve of the meeting, a news conference by the Soviet delegation was held at the USSR Embassy. The members of the delegation were Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council; Valentin Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Yegor Yakovlev, editor in chief of the newspaper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. And although the forum is devoted to European problems, the questions put by journalists did in the main concern the situation in our country.

Early this morning Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev met Laurent Fabius, president of the French National Assembly. In the course of the conversation the problems of the international situation and the prospects for the development of Soviet-French relations and cooperation were discussed.

At 1030—30 minutes late owing to a huge traffic jam—the participants in the forum set about their work. Thus, there were three roundtables: Does Europe need Germany and Germany Europe?; Germany as a Superpower: Illusion or Reality?; and the External Threat: Military Doctrines and Armaments. All these are important. There can be no argument about that. But there is such a persistent thing as history which has been and remains the creator of the fates of both states and people.

[Yakovlev] The unification of Germany has become possible solely as a result of those fundamental, constructive changes that have formed in Europe with respect to East-West, especially in the mid-80's. These changes, at times dramatic but mainly creative, are connected first and foremost with the overall perestroyka in international relations after 1985. They are opening up new horizons before the political culture of the continent.

[Yezvitov] France's president arrived at the forum straight from New York, where he made a speech at the United Nations. Europe is inconceivable without Germany. Europe is our common home. Life in it cannot go on without harmony among former enemies, but this home can only be built if everyone in it feels that they are good neighbors. Today Francois Mitterand and Aleksandr Yakovlev had a brief meeting. Issues of mutual interest were discussed. [end recording]

Confers With EC Chairman

LD2609081790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0220 GMT 26 Sep 90

[From the "TASS Foreign News Roundup"]

[Text] Paris [no date as received]—USSR Presidential Council member A.N. Yakovlev, who participated in the international forum "Germany and Europe" here, met

with French Prime Minister Michel Rocard on a wide range of problems, including the present-day international situation, the situation in the USSR, and the prospects for developing Soviet-French relations. There was also a meeting with EC Chairman Jacques Delors devoted mainly to possibilities of extending contacts between the USSR and the EC in light of the transformations taking place in the Soviet Union.

Delegates Head to European Parliamentary Meeting

LD2509130290 Moscow TASS in English 1253 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Krivykh]

[Text] Paris September 25 TASS—A delegation from the Soviet parliament arrived here today. The delegation, led by chairman of the Soviet parliament's Council of the Union Ivan Laptev, will leave later today for Strasbourg to attend the Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly.

North Atlantic Assembly Delegates Visit Ukraine

PM2009130790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[UKRINFORM-TASS report: "Guests of the Ukraine"]

[Text] Kiev, 14 Sep—A delegation from the North Atlantic Assembly subcommittee for East Europe and the Soviet Union has ended its stay in the Ukraine.

The guests had a talk in the republic's Supreme Soviet. Special attention was paid to the declaration on the Ukraine's state sovereignty and ways of implementing it. There was talk of how the changes taking place in the republic will promote its participation in the all-European process.

German Plan for New Helicopter Questioned

PM2509092390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent A. Balandin: "Are the 'Chameleons' Necessary?"]

[Text] Bonn—The 56th Franco-West German conference at government level is now being held in Munich. Problems of bilateral relations, the new situation on the European continent and in the world, and questions of security are under discussion.

There is talk of creating a new type of helicopter for the NATO army, the "HX-90"; France, Italy, and the Netherlands would take part with Germany in its development. Experts estimate the German side's expenditure at 7.2 billion deutsch marks [DM], but that is without counting the cost of the spare parts, additional apparatus, equipment, servicing, and taxes. What is more, the calculations were based on 1988 prices. The military's new "toy" will in fact cost local taxpayers more than DM10 billion. If you add the expenditure on the antitank helicopter that is being developed, the total soars immediately to DM20 billion. All this comes against the backdrop of the calls for economy measures and hints of a possible need to "tighten belts" because of sizable expenditure on the "Eastern relatives."

The military have their own logic: Old models become obsolete, they must be replaced by new ones. According to Defense Ministry spokesmen, the quantity of machines must match the number currently in the arsenal. But what about politicians' logic? Or have they too heard nothing of disarmament and the impending cuts in the army, including the Bundeswehr?

FRG Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg tried to justify the need for the modification by the fact that the armed forces must not lose their flexibility and mobility in connection with their reorganization. But he is not greatly worried by the fact that the capability for offensive operations is in fact really being boosted, despite verbal denials of this.

It cannot be said that all politicians have greeted with delight these plans put forward by the military department and the government. The "Greens" and the Social Democrats, and even some of the Liberals, unequivocally oppose them. "In the contemporary world when the disarmament policy is giving mankind the chance of survival, this project is a total anachronism," K. Fuchs, deputy chairman of the Social Democratic Party Bundeswehr faction's working group on foreign policy and security questions, said.

But you cannot trouble representatives of the military-industrial complex with statements of this kind. Revenue is the prime concern. The experience of the arms trade with Iraq seems to have taught them nothing. Many political observers are asking whether the Bundeswehr really needs these helicopters. There is an easy calculation to be made: If one machine can transport no more than 20 soldiers, is it really designed solely for purposes of transportation? The following question arises: If the Bundeswehr is reducing its numerical strength and if NATO is taking the principle of defense sufficiency as a base, why are these costly "chameleons" necessary?

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Kazakh Leaders Meet U.S. Businessmen

LD2409195690 Moscow TASS in English 1920 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 24 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev, President of the Kazakh Republic Nursultan Nazarbayev, Chairman of the Kazakh Council of Ministers U. Karamanov met in the Kremlin today with president of the American Trading Consortium James Griffin, chairman of the board of directors of Archer Daniels Midland Co. Dwayne Andreas, chairman of the board of directors of Johnson and Johnson Corporation William Dearstayne, vice-president of Chevron Overseas E. Scott.

A large project of Kazakhstan's cooperation with members of the American Trading Consortium was discussed. Representatives of the firms studied in Kazakhstan the conditions of creating joint ventures to develop oil deposits, cooperation in agriculture, in processing of raw materials and agricultural machine building. Appropriate agreements and a plan for the drafting of a joint programme for Kazakhstan's speedy economic development were signed in Alma Ata.

The discussion of this project with the Soviet president emphasises its unprecedented scope, its importance for the development of the republic's economy on a contemporary basis, improvement of the living standards of the population and makes it a major action in Soviet-American economic ties as a whole.

Gorbachev asked details of all the aspects of the prepared programme and emphasised particularly the fact that the development of oil and gas resources, profitable, naturally, for both sides, presupposes the use of the latest technologies ensuring a high productivity and economic effectiveness in the given conditions and complete safety for the environment. Gorbachev was particularly interested in the connection between oil and gas part of the project with cooperation for improving the standards of farm production and of quality of products, as well as other social characteristics of cooperation and its results tangible for the population.

With duly taking into account these components in the programme, the Soviet president promised support and assistance in securing the necessary legislative guarantees for the stability of conditions for fulfilling agreements.

This [is] a long-term project which envisages the participation of some other republics.

Bush Speaks to Arab-American Group on Gulf

LD2509091190 Moscow TASS in English 0853 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Washington September 25 TASS—President George Bush said on Monday that the ever more frequent calls provoking violence, acts of discrimination and direct intimidation with physical violence against Arab-Americans arouse nothing but indignation and disgust.

Bush was speaking to a group of Arab-Americans in the White House. They complained of a hate campaign against Arab-Americans since the Gulf crisis erupted last month. Racists beat people with Arab descent, desecrate mosques and stage acts of vandalism against cafes, shops, houses and other property belonging to Arabs.

The American President said such actions could be likened to an act of cowardly aggression, and that there should be no place for such hate crimes in any civilized society.

Bush availed himself of the opportunity to emphasise once again that there could be no question of talks with Iraq until the latter withdraws troops from Kuwait "completely, immediately and without condition".

He also said that "Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored and the security and stability of the Persian Gulf assured."

The President described as unprecedented the unity of countries in measures to counter the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait and emphasised that President Saddam Husayn was in utter isolation.

U.S. Decision To Cut Foreign Bases Viewed

PM2509153790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin "Observer's Opinion": "In the Spirit of the New Strategy"]

[Text] Foreign mass media have commented in concert on U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney's statement on the intention of the U.S. military-political leadership to curtail operations and reduce the number of personnel at 150 military installations outside America. It is reported that it is a question, above all, of Germany, Spain, and South Korea. Note has to be taken of the fact that this statement has been made. The arguments are logical: to reduce the likelihood of the emergence of conflict situations with the Soviet Union and to save money.

And it is not difficult to discern the following important aspect. R. Cheney's striking gesture squares totally with the new U.S. strategy outlined by the Pentagon chief in his recent lengthy speech at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in Homestead (Virginia). The essence of the general orientation of military building in the very short term seems to give rise to no doubts: Without changing course in principle, it is proposed to shift the emphasis toward improving the Armed Forces' readiness to respond to the emergence of a threat to U.S. interests at various points on the planet.

The crisis in the Persian Gulf area has shifted the process of forming the new strategy out of the sphere of an

armchair quest into the sphere of a large-scale experiment. The best possible "test site" has turned up: the huge distance from the United States, the very difficult climatic conditions, a strong and numerous enemy in the shape of the Iraqi Army—all this makes it possible to verify the viability of the new concept. And the financial aspect is already clear. In order to "respond," a tremendous amount of funds is needed.

These are probably the questions that the Pentagon has asked itself: Must we continue to scatter our forces, maintaining installations with combat hardware and personnel throughout the world? Would it not be better and cheaper to begin concentrating them at home and to carry out the centralized preparation of highly mobile units after the pattern of the 82d Airborne Division? To judge from the planned actions, they are also finding the answers to these questions.

Russia Signs Cigarette Deal With U.S. Company

PM2509120190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Fedor Ivanov: "Philip Morris Has Concluded Contract of the Century with Russia"]

[Text] Moscow—The U.S. company Philip Morris has signed a contract with the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] on the delivery of over 20 billion cigarettes by the end of 1991.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent was told by a spokesman for the company, Robert Rozen, that the deal became possible thanks to a direct appeal from the republic's government to the company leadership. In Rozen's opinion this is the biggest one-off contract in Philip Morris' entire history. Deliveries of cigarettes to Russia will begin in October 1990. It is planned to send seven or eight sorts of cigarettes produced at factories in the United States and other countries.

Philip Morris began trade cooperation with the Soviet Union 20 years ago. In 1975 the joint production of the "Soyuz-Apollo" cigarettes began in Moscow. In 1977 the USSR bought from the company the license to produce Marlboro cigarettes.

The cigarettes received under the recent contract are intended for sale only for rubles and are not planned for sale in currency shops. In addition to this contract Philip Morris and the Russian Government have signed two protocols. The first provides for the continuation of cigarette deliveries for the period 1992 through 1995. According to the second protocol Philip Morris will begin to take an active part in the modernization of the tobacco industry in both the RSFSR and the Soviet Union. According to Robert Rozen it may also be a case of constructing new factories belonging wholly or in part to the company. This, he said, is a traditional form of cooperation for Philip Morris and we would not like to retreat from it.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Greets Japanese Politicians on Culture Week

Holds Meeting 25 Sep

LD2509175290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 September (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev met with a group of Japanese parliamentary deputies from the Liberal Democratic Party, headed by Keizo Obuchi, at the Supreme Soviet today. The group is in the USSR in connection with Japanese culture week. In a brief conversation, a high assessment was given of the importance of such initiatives with the participation of authoritative figures in order to cultivate good neighborliness and mutual understanding between peoples.

The president confirmed his intention of visiting Japan next spring, and considers that this will be an important landmark in Soviet-Japanese relations, the improvement of which is an essential and important element of the new and peaceful period of history. The head of the delegation conveyed a message from Shintaro Abe, an eminent figure in the Liberal Democratic Party, whom Mikhail Gorbachev has met on several previous occasions.

Seeks Better Ties

OW2609043590 Tokyo KYODO in English 0330 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept. 26 KYODO—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on Tuesday [25 September] told members of a Japanese parliamentary delegation that he is considering positively working with Japan to improve bilateral relations.

Former chief Cabinet Secretary Keizo Obuchi quoted Gorbachev as saying it is not normal that relations between the two neighboring countries have long remained frozen.

Obuchi is leading the 54-member delegation, comprised mainly of members of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party, which is to participate in a Japanese cultural festival and meet Soviet political leaders.

During a 10-minute meeting at the Supreme Soviet, Obuchi asked Gorbachev, who will visit Japan next April, to make a decisive decision on the territorial dispute over Soviet-held islands off Japan's northernmost main island of Hokkaido and open a new page for bilateral relations.

"Let's consider together," Gorbachev was quoted as replying.

Meanwhile, Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov met three other Japanese delegates, including House of Representatives member Toshio Yamaguchi, on Tuesday. He stressed the need for the peaceful resolution of the

territorial issue, while also claiming that the matter had already been settled between the two nations after the end of World War II.

Yazov also mentioned the 149 Soviet military experts who have remained in Iraq following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on August 2, and said 73 of them will return home this year.

The delegation will be in Moscow until next Wednesday.

Lukyanov Addresses Ceremony

OW2609062390 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 23 Sep 90

[Speech by Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at the opening ceremony of Japanese Culture Week held at the Moscow Palace of Youth on 22 September; read by announcer]

[Text] Respectable members of the Japanese parliamentary delegation, Mr. and Mrs. Ambassador of Japan, and all friends present at this ceremony today: I am very pleased to have this opportunity to greet the opening ceremony of Japanese culture week. There is no doubt Japanese culture week will become an important epoch in the relations and mutual understanding between our nations and our peoples. Cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and Japan have already become not only a tradition but a tradition filled with good faith. This tradition has become an increasingly substantial one with new form and substance, and this fact can be well exemplified in this Japanese culture week held in the Soviet Union.

The idea of holding a Japanese culture week was studied carefully for a very long time. During his visit to the Soviet Union last January, former Foreign Minister Abe presented President Gorbachev with an eight-point proposal to promote Soviet-Japanese exchanges and cooperation. This proposal has become an important part of a joint project to promote relations between our two nations and our two peoples.

I think that Soviet-Japanese cultural cooperation is closely linked to the fact that certain similar spiritual factors exist in the peoples of our two nations. Is it not because of this spiritual similarity that Japanese love works written by such writers as Tolstoy, Dostoevski, and Chekhov; love Russian folk songs and music by Tchaikovsky and Rachmaninnoff; and are attracted to paintings by Russian artists?

On the other hand, Russians have a strong interest in original Japanese poems, including haiku and tanka, poems written by Basho and Takuboku Ishikawa [noted haiku and tanka poets], and also in the Japanese people's achievements. They are also greatly impressed with Japanese art, flower arrangement, and tea ceremony as means to have a deeper understanding of nature and the human soul. I feel that this is also a result of the similar spirituality shared by our two peoples. I think herein lies the thread or the bridge that brings our two peoples together.

During my visit to Japan, I was told that every bridge, no matter how small, has its own unique shape and name. I felt then that it is precisely such art, with its own unique form and nature, that serves as a bridge to connect people, hearts, and various cities and to unite all mankind. In fact, as Mr. Obuchi, former Japanese cabinet secretary and leader of the Japanese delegation, said, the current Japanese culture week, while providing us with the chance to get in touch with art, especially with Japanese culture, is being held amidst a warm wind that is blowing throughout the whole world. It is being held under favorable conditions in which the people of the world, including the Soviet and Japanese peoples, are moving toward cooperation and goodwill.

This is the very reason why the Japanese are eagerly waiting for President Gorbachev's visit, which will be the first ever to Japan by a Soviet head of state. We have started overall preparations for President Gorbachev's visit. We are preparing documents, including programs for cooperation covering the remaining 10 years before the start of the 21st century. Here again, I would like to express my sincerest wish for the success of this Japanese culture week.

I am convinced that Japanese culture week in Moscow this time will give both Muscovites and tourists visiting Moscow a good opportunity to understand the culture of the Japanese, who have made great achievements in such fields as technology and electronics and who have preciously cherished and carefully preserved its own culture and tradition as well as its own art that have no comparison in the world.

I wish the Japanese culture week good luck and hope it will be an excellent event. I hope the Soviet people will get a better understanding of Japanese culture. I sincerely hope that the current Japanese culture week will serve to further improve the good relations between our two nations and that in the rough seas of the modern world, the Soviet Union and Japan will become good partners in taking the road toward achieving peace.

Japanese Parliamentarian Speaks

OW2609062190 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 23 Sep 90

[Speech by Keizo Obuchi, former Japanese chief cabinet secretary and leader of a Japanese parliamentary delegation currently visiting Moscow, at the opening ceremony of Japanese Culture Week held at the Moscow Palace of Youth on 22 September—recorded]

[Text] I would like to offer my congratulations on the opening of Japanese culture week in the presence of His Excellency Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Mrs. Lukyanov.

It goes without saying that Japan and the Soviet Union are two neighboring nations holding important positions in the international community. The domestic and foreign policies of our two nations greatly influence our region as well as the international community, and this has been well proven by the fact that the Soviet policy of perestroyka has played a decisive role in improving East-West relations.

It can be readily imagined that the relations between two such nations will have a great influence not only on the two nations themselves and their peoples but also on the international community, especially on the future of the Asian-Pacific region. As is known, in promoting the relations between our two nations, we have extensively activated and multiplied our exchanges in various fields, including politics, economy, and culture. We must concentrate our efforts on building, as soon as possible, bilateral relations that befit our two nations and also on turning great unused potentials into something concrete.

Dietman Shintaro Abe visited the Soviet Union last January and made an eight-point proposal to President Gorbachev on improving cooperation and exchanges between our two nations. The proposal embodied Japan's intention to drastically improve Japanese-Soviet relations. I am full of joy to see that such a grand opening ceremony has been planned for Japanese culture week, which was part of the eight-point proposal on improving Japanese-Soviet exchanges and cooperation.

Our two nations have different origins, one originating in Oriental civilization and the other originating in Western civilization. However, through many long years, we have both cultivated spiritual cultures that we can be proud of in the world. At the same time, not only because we are neighboring nations but because our cultures have their own universality and individuality, we have cherished great interest in as well as attachment to and enchantment of each other's culture.

The programs for the current Japanese culture week are unprecedented in variety and scale. I may have said this before, but I would like to state my expectations that through these activities, the Soviet people will have the chance to come in touch with the traditional culture the Japanese have cultivated over the years and which has been handed down from one generation to another. I hope they will also come in touch with contemporary culture that will lead the times. Thus, they will be able to enjoy the marvelous integration of both the traditional and contemporary natures of our culture.

As for the Soviet Union, a Soviet culture week will be held in Japan during His Excellency President Gorbachev's visit to Japan next April. I have great expectations that the mutual understanding between Japan and the Soviet Union will be further deepened through such activities.

Finally, I would like to conclude my greetings by expressing my heartfelt respects and gratitude for the understanding and great assistance rendered by those concerned with Japanese-Soviet relations in translating the project of Japanese culture week in the Soviet Union into reality. Thank you very much.

'Deletion' in Japan's New Defense White Paper Eyed

OW2609053290 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 21 Sep 90

["Excerpts" of report by IZVESTIYA Tokyo correspondent (Anafoyev), published in a recent issue of IZVESTIYA, on the newly published Japanese defense white paper]

[Text] Japanese mass media have reacted with great concern to the current defense white paper because part of it differs from the past 10 versions; namely, the Defense Agency has made a noteworthy partial deletion. In other words, a passage concerning the Soviet military threat, which traditionally has been included in such papers in the past, has been deleted. This passage reportedly was included in the original draft, but subsequently was deleted because of Prime Minister Kaifu's personal pressure as well as the opposition of other cabinet members.

Of course, it is pleasant that the Soviet Union has been praised in a very special way. However, we could have pointed out this fact with satisfaction had we not noticed that the author of the defense paper had deleted the unfortunate technical term without changing the overall original argument that supports it.

What is more important in the white paper's current version is a symbol, but not grounds for the argument. Moreover, it is the symbol that has been changed into indisputable grounds for the argument that used to be taken into account in forming policies and that had taken firm root [in Japan] during the cold war, and also into a motive that may lead to some sort of stimulation. We can say without any conditions that the deletion is progress.

We would like to mention other points here. In deleting the passage on the Soviet threat, the Defense Agency has opened up a new chapter in Japanese foreign policy and disclosed a series of problems that Japan, an outstanding nation, will have to settle in the very near future.

It can be said that the myth of the Soviet threat that has been mentioned frequently in Japanese political circles is almost the last pretext that the Japanese Government has maintained in the its foreign policy. In fact, this pretext has ceased to exist. When the Japanese Government finally deleted this stereotypical phrase of the past, it certainly was no accident that Japan was the last nation among the so-called Western club, or among its Western allies, to make this decison, not to mention that it was made under pressure from Western nations, particularly through strong pressure from the United States.

When viewed from this standpoint, we believe that the deletion of the passage on the Soviet threat was made with President Gorbachev's visit to Japan in mind. However, I do not believe that this is in any way a goodwill gesture toward the Soviet Government. Herein lies something more important that goes far beyond the framework of Soviet-Japanese relations. It implies that Japan must part with a very advantageous position which has been maintained and which has bolstered its great interests over the years since World War II.

Since the end of the war, the United States has done its best to prevent Japan from breaking away from the major framework of both global and regional policies. While moving behind its great ally, the United States, and following U.S. policies in a strict way, Japan has concentrated its efforts on its own economic construction. It carried out its economic construction even during the age when there was extreme tension and severe confrontation between Eastern and Western forces. The United States as well as the European nations had to pay a high price for the confrontation. Meanwhile, in its fight against the Soviet threat, Japan was the only nation able to gain profits by taking advantage of economic cracks [sakeme] caused by the arms race in the United Staes and Europe.

However, times have changed, and the end of the cold war was declared at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Malta last December. It seems that all nations have accepted this with satisfaction, with the Japanese Government being the lone exception. As far as the Japanese Government is concerned, the Malta declaration signified an end to the longest period in history in which Japan was assured of prosperity. It also has resulted in a major change that probably will bring about serious losses in its relations with its closest partner.

Under the new international situation and in the course of these truly historic changes, Japan seems to have been left behind as an onlooker, and not as a participant. No matter what diplomatic problems Japan will solve in Europe, Asia, or in the Middle East in the future, I believe that the Soviet Union is the nation whose existence Japan can never afford to ignore.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Gorbachev Meets Singapore Prime Minister

LD2509175990 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—It was officially announced here today that President Gorbachev met with Prime Minister of the Republic of Singapore Lee Kuan Yew in the Kremlin on September 25. Meeting the prominent stateman who played an important progressive role in the destinies of Singapore, Gorbachev emphasised the importance of Soviet-Singapore relations which, going by the negotiations held these days, have good prospects. Gorbachev said that this is also connected with profound transformations in the political and economic system of Soviet society.

Relations between the two countries that are so different were assessed in the context of overall changes in Asia and the whole world under the impact of new notions of the world's integrity and new attitude to the rights of every nation and state to its own way of life and socio-political choice which presupposes respect for national values and contribution of every people to common progress.

The world, also the Third World, is burdened with problems. World politics should be aimed at cooperation and mutual understanding among countries, taking into consideration the balance of interests, and regardless of the level of development of states, the nature of their systems, and other specific features.

The situation in the Persian Gulf was discussed. The views of the crisis coincided. The president and the prime minister deem it possible to overcome it in a peaceful way, if the Security Council, its five permanent members and entire United Nations show staunchness and unity in the implementation of the resolutions without abandoning the quest for a political way out.

If the United Nations which now receives an opportunity to act in accordance with its purposes is able to find such a way out, this will be of huge principled importance for the shaping of a new world order.

Gorbachev and Le Kuan Yew expressed satisfaction with the results of an official visit and their first meeting.

New Ambassador to Vietnam Presents Credentials

LD2609085190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0450 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Denisovich]

[Text] Hanoi, 26 Sep (TASS)—R.L. Khamidulin, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRV] presented his credentials here to Vo Chi Cong, chairman of the State Council of the SRV. The Vietnamese leader, welcoming this appointment, expressed hope that the new Soviet ambassador will fulfill the responsible task placed on him and will make a weighty contribution to the cause of further deepening of the good relations between the SRV and the USSR.

Vietnam, he said, is conducting a consistent policy aimed at strengthening and developing relations of traditional friendship and multilateral cooperation in the interests of the peoples of the two countries, and peace and social progress in Southeast Asia, Asia [as received], and in the world as a whole.

Vo Chi Cong expressed sincere gratitude for the aid and support given by the CPSU, the government, and the Soviet people to Vietnam, and also the certainty that the

Soviet people will overcome all difficulties and trials on the path of building socialism.

Near East & South Asia

Jordanian Crown Prince Interviewed on Gulf

PM2509211590 Moscow TRUD in Russian
26 Sep 90 p 3

[Interview with Crown Prince Hasan of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan by TRUD correspondent Z. Nalbandyan: "War Will Not Solve the Problems"; place and date not given]

[Text] [Nalbandyan] Your Highness, the Persian Gulf crisis has split the Near East and has changed traditional views and assessments. How would you define Jordan's place on the political map of the region today?

[Hasan] Jordan is on the side of peaceful solution to the problems which have emerged, on the side of political settlement of the conflict. Our country has experienced quite a few wars over the last decades, and we are well aware of what happens in the Near East when the guns start talking. I can clearly imagine the response that a bombing of Iraq would produce in other capitals in the region, the escalation of war hysteria it would create.

[Nalbandyan] Do you believe that a peaceful resolution of the conflict is possible?

[Hasan] Zbigniew Brzezinski recently said that there are three possible scenarios which could be applied to the current crisis: Either to strike against Iraq, or to suffocate Iraq, or to seek a third way. It seems to us that the third way is the way of talks, and it is the one we advocate.

Unfortunately, events are developing according to a different scenario. We are inexorably sliding toward a military confrontation, toward a tragedy on a vast scale. Nobody is willing to even hear any talk about peace. Our constant appeals to find grounds for talks seem to be already causing irritation. Like a tiny mosquito, you know, which flies everywhere and annoys everyone.

[Nalbandyan] But many people believe that Jordan has taken a frankly pro-Iraqi position in the conflict.

[Hasan] I think that this is the result of misunderstanding. From the very first day, Jordan has adhered to a clear position: We are against the annexation of Kuwait and we support al-Sabah's legitimate government. This is perfectly clearly known to our friends in Iraq.

At the same time, however, we cannot accept such a large-scale concentration of Armed Forces belonging to non-Arab, non-Muslim states on Arab land. The West is worried about the oil problem and it does not trust the Arabs to solve their own problems.

[Nalbandyan] How do you envisage an "Arab solution" to the conflict?

[Hasan] First of all, I would like to say with utmost certainty that the impending war will not solve any problems. The Near East and the Arabian peninsula are full of disputed questions. Whereas the West believes that the restoration of law and order in the region is possible only by means of carrying out a large-scale "surgical operation," we consider that future generations will only gain if we manage to preserve the region's integrity and stability. Why not try something like the Helsinki CSCE? Surely something like that could offer good services in the Near East?

[Nalbandyan] Does this mean that you are calling for interlinkage of all the main regional problems?

[Hasan] No. The Kuwaiti crisis should not be coupled with the Palestinian or the Lebanese problems. But there must be a common principle of approach toward all these complex questions. For example, people do not understand why the world community, which so eagerly descended on Iraq for its annexation of Kuwait, pays no attention to Israel's 23 years long occupation of Arab lands. Is this fair? Why does the West apply different moral standards to Israel and Iraq?

[Nalbandyan] What could be discussed at the "Near East Helsinki meeting"?

[Hasan] Iraq and Kuwait have long-standing territorial and financial disputes. Why should the Arabs not be the arbiters there? Or, say that Iraq withdraws its troops from Kuwait. How will that country's demographic structure be resolved? Calls can be heard from the Arabian peninsula to expell from Kuwait all Palestinians which are allegedly collaborating with the Iraqis. But Palestinians have lived there for 40 years. Is this not a question to be discussed? And generally speaking, almost all countries along the Persian Gulf coastline have mutual territorial claims....

[Nalbandyan] Jordan is being blamed for not fully applying economic sanctions against Iraq. Specifically, the oil trade is continuing.

[Hasan] This is not true. As a result of sanctions, Jordan has found itself in a more difficult situation than Iraq. As for oil, the situation here is perfectly clear. By way of repayment of its war debts, Iraq is delivering to us oil at reduced prices. It is not Iraq but Jordan that gains from this. Incidentally, this is now our sole oil "intake." The other half of the oil we need used to be supplied by Saudi Arabia, but these deliveries ceased as of 20 September.

On the other hand, the question of economic sanctions against Iraq—this is essentially a question of when exactly a military strike should be delivered. I say this because, when imposing the sanctions, the UN Security Council did not specify how their effectiveness will be appraised. When will they be 70-percent effective, and when will they be 90-percent effective? Thus, the Security Council ought to examine this more carefully.

[Nalbandyan] It is claimed in the West the S. Husayn presents a direct danger to peace and stability in the region. What is your attitude toward the Iraqi president's personality?

[Hasan] It seems to me that impulsive behavior by a country's leader, which could lead to events like the occupation or annexation of another state, is certainly dangerous in our region. At the same time, however, complete isolation is one of the causes of such a danger. When the whole world dubs you schizophrenic, when all your connections are severed and at the same time a vast force is being built up to descend upon you....

Nobody wants to talk to him. The Americans and all the other states, having decided to crucify S. Husayn, do not want to even listen to any talk about peace and political dialogue. Such are the rules of the game. It is built entirely on hatred for the Iraqi leader.

[Nalbandyan] King Husayn of Jordan recently met the heads of state of Algeria and Morocco in Rabat. It was reported that they talked about the Persian Gulf crisis. Could we expect any positive moves as a result of this meeting?

[Hasan] You know, nowadays I feel almost constantly that we are a hairbreadth away from war. But at times I suddenly perceive a ray of hope. Rabat was one such ray for me.

[Nalbandyan] What is the role played by psychology in the present crisis? Do the sides understand one another well?

[Hasan] There are quite a few suspicions and misunderstanding even in the allies' camp. The West still looks upon us as "disagreeable Arabs," adherents of totalitarianism and autocracy. This image was built up over the decades and is actively maintained now.

On the other hand, people in the Arab countries realize that the concentration of a military steel fist in the region is dictated by the West's worry about oil and its future. This is the main point.

It is no accident that U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker speaks of creating some sort of structure to ensure security in the region, while British Premier Margaret Thatcher promoted the idea of instituting a deterrence system. But who is to be deterred? If Iraq pulled out of Kuwait, what would be the purpose of an international or western presence?

There is also a global misunderstanding of the mentality of the peoples inhabiting the Near East by the main protagonists in the international process. A special question as regards the Soviet Union. We welcome glasnost and perestroyka, your country's desire for disarmament. But we still hope that the USSR will retain its understanding of the Arab peoples' aspirations. Otherwise the Arabs will have nobody who could hear and understand them.

The time has now come to move on from bilateral relations between specific countries to transnational relations. If a broader and more comprehensive view were taken of the Near East, mutual understanding would be that much greater.

Saudi Pilgrimage Minister Ends Moscow Visit

LD2309053490 Riyadh SPA in Arabic 2200 GMT 22 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 22 Sep (SPA)—His Excellency 'Abd-al-Wahhab Abd-al-Wasi, minister of pilgrimage affairs and religious trusts, held a series of meetings with Islamic leaderships during his visit to the Soviet Union, which he concluded tonight.

Among the meetings he held was a meeting with the chairman of the council of religious affairs at the Soviet Council of Ministers, Khristoradnov, and Mufti Tal'gat Tadzhuddin, chairman of the spiritual administrations of the Muslims of the European regions of the USSR and Siberia.

At the beginning, the chairman of the council of religious affairs lauded the distinguished Islamic role which is played by the government of the custodian of the two holy mosques, King Fahd Bin-'Abd-al-'Aziz and its efforts in the service of Islam and the Muslims.

He noted with pride the hospitality of the custodian of the two holy mosques accorded to a group of pilgrims from the Soviet Union in the last pilgrimage session and the gift of one million copies of the holy Koran to the Muslims of the Soviet Union.

He praised the resumption of Saudi-Soviet diplomatic relations and he described this step as important.

On his part, the minister of pilgrimage affairs and religious trusts said the resumption of diplomatic relations between the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the Soviet Union will provide an opportunity for cooperation between the two countries in numerous fields.

He expressed the hope of providing more services for the Muslims of the Soviet Union and, above all, printing copies of the holy Koran and a translation of the meanings of the holy book in the languages which they speak.

During the meeting they discussed some Islamic issues and, in particular, issues which concern the affairs of Soviet pilgrims.

His Excellency 'Abd-al-Wahhab Abd-al-Wasi also met with Mansur Anvarov, the deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic of Bashkiriya, one of the Islamic republics in the USSR. He discussed with him matters concerning Muslims in that republic.

On the other hand, the minister of pilgrimage affairs and religious trusts and His Eminence Shaykh Muhammad 'Abd al-Wahhab al-Subayl and the accompanying Saudi delegation visited mosques and Islamic institutes.

Shaykh Muhammad al-Subayl led the Muslims to prayers at Moscow mosque and delivered the Friday sermon yesterday.

Syrian Leader's Visit to Tehran Assessed

NC2609082290 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad's visit to Tehran came at a time when the crisis is worsening in the Persian Gulf crisis. Our commentator writes:

There are no differences between Tehran and Damascus in their political assessment of Iraq's aggression against Kuwait which has sparked off the crisis in the Persian Gulf. Both sides have categorically condemned this aggression and have called for the reestablishment of Kuwait's independence. But it is another issue on how far apart the two sides are when it comes to supporting international sanctions in order to force Baghdad to withdraw its forces from foreign territory.

I think that this readiness is linked with the compatibility of the regimes of Iran and Syria with the international situation that have been influenced by new political thought. I think the fact that Damascus' diplomacy aimed at eliminating the consequences of the Iraqi aggression is more active is proof of the Syrian leadership's belief in and recognition of the irreversibility of the new reality which has emerged with the conclusion of the cold war between the East and West, with the transition by the superpowers from confrontation to cooperation, and with the elimination of ideological stands from the superpowers' relations with countries of the third world.

Damascus is moving within the framework of a common Arab strategy on solving the Persian Gulf crisis, while not rejecting cooperation with the Soviet Union and the United States. And it is exactly this point that sparks off some worries in Tehran which is more inclined toward the old policy of preserving the balance between the East and West.

The Iranian press see the footprints of the two superpowers' influence in Syria's policy and allege that the Soviet Union's two-sided stand on the Persian Gulf crisis compels Damascus to condemn U.S. presence in the Persian Gulf while the Bush administration allegedly intends to use the Syrian regime as a middleman in Iranian-U.S. relations.

I do not think that Syrian opposition to the U.S. military presence is influenced by the Soviet Union, but that the most major part is played by reasons of logic which cannot be threatened by force. Both the Soviet and the Syrian politicians are influenced by this logic. Meanwhile, anyone who opposes the expansion of the U.S. military and naval presence in the region does not, in any way, invalidate cooperation with the White House in a political solution of the crisis. This is exactly the basis of the Soviet position.

There are no two-sided influences in Soviet policy, or are there any signs of this two-sided influence on Syrian policy which Tehran sees to be similar to Soviet policy. If Washington is actually trying to use Damascus as its mediator, then I think that Tehran should be not be worried. The Iranian leadership cannot find a better mediator because Syrian-Iranian relations have been characterized by mutual trust and stability for many years.

The visit paid by Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad to Tehran has only led to the consolidation and expansion of these relations.

Persian Gulf Crisis Causes Oil Price Spiral

NC2509180090 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Commentary by Yuriy Andreyev from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Esteemed listeners: Oil prices have risen to an unprecedented high at an average of more than $35 per barrel. The boom in oil prices does not show any signs of subsiding.

For the past decade, oil has become the weak point of the contemporary industrial world. This crude, valuable, and strategic substance has been the source of numerous conflicts and breaks between countries, as well as the cause of many severe political clashes.

Near East events demonstrate this. Oil has been a boon and source of wealth in this region, as well as a cause of its misfortune and suffering. Thus, there is no reason to review history. The root of the present crisis in the Persian Gulf region is also hidden in oil.

Saddam Husayn has coveted immensely oil-rich Kywait, and the propaganda about its annexation is not important. We know that the Kuwait crisis has been instrumental in the crucial changes in the international oil market. Iraq and Kuwait provided approximately 20 percent of this black gold required by the Western industrial countries, but now, because of the UN sanctions imposed on Iraq, the international oil market is receiving nearly four million fewer barrels of oil daily.

As a result, oil prices soared and confusion and apprehension gripped the market. However, despite the constraints of time and the sensitivity of the situation, OPEC became, as has always been the case, a playground for differences of opinion. The Western allies, and Saudi Arabia louder than anyone else, called for increasing oil production so that its prices could drop.

Another faction in OPEC benefiting from a price hike did not seem to be in a hurry to take immediate measures. For example, Tehran assumed a stoic posture

of calm. Only a short while earlier, Iranian Petroleum Minister Gholamreza Aqazadeh, had said that the international oil market did not need extraordinary measures. Iran insisted that all OPEC members should adhere to their quotas and that it did not think an emergency OPEC session was necessary.

A division emerged in the OPEC ranks, and this organization was almost on the verge of disintegration. However, all the sides managed to reach a compromise. At the end of August, an unofficial conference of the petroleum ministers of the OPEC member countries was convened in Geneva, and a consensus was attained on the bolstering of oil production. Now Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, the United Arab Emirates, and many other countries have started producing more than the specified levels, so that the shortage of oil on the international market may be reduced.

Tehran then announced that the price of Iranian oil had increased and reached the level of $28 per barrel. It appeared that oil prices had stabilized, and in fact the price indicated a downward trend. However, the political element set to work once again. The danger of the outbreak of large-scale war in the Near East, increasing daily, shattered this relative equilibrium which had been achieved with great difficulty. Prices spiraled again spiraled; worse, one should not even anticipate any possibility of its stabilizing in the near future.

Today, the fate of the international oil market depends entirely on the manner of the conflicts in the Near East.

Soviet Veterans' Trip to Afghanistan Viewed

LD2509170590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report by correspondent B. Biragov; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] A delegation of the Union of Veterans of Afghanistan was in Kabul from 21 to 24 September.

[Begin recording] [B. Biragov] This is not the first time since the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan that internationalist servicemen have been arrived in Kabul. And almost always they come here from the airport to the Bala-Hesar fortress to once again pay tribute to their comrades-in-arms.

In the House of Soviet Science and Culture, a meeting took place between representatives of the Afghan public and the delegation of the Union of Veterans of Afghanistan. At this meeting the Soviet internationalist servicemen presented 20 wheelchairs as gifts to Afghan war disabled. I must admit that it was very difficult to decide to show these sequences, but there was no way one could not. One would wish for them to be seen in our country and in others. Look into the faces of these young officers and men who were maimed near Khowst, Jalalabad, Qandahar, and Kabul. There are 20 of them here. How many more of these lads are there in Afghanistan and in our homeland? It may be that this act of charity will become one more argument in favor of peace and against the continuation of the senseless fratricidal war in Afghanistan.

And here, in the conference hall of the Afghan Organization of Peace, Solidarity and Friendship, a news conference of the members of the Soviet delegation was held with Afghan and Soviet journalists. (Aleksandr Katenin), chairman of the board of the Union of Veterans of Afghanistan, and (Aleksandr Rutskoy), here of the Soviet Union, member of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, answered journalists' questions, spoke about the work of the Organization of Internationalist Servicemen, and shared their plans for the further development of mutually advantageous ties. Prior to their departure for Moscow, the members of the delegation were received by Najibullah, president of the Republic of Afghhanistan. At the meeting, which took place in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, the president spoke about the military-political situation in the country and the successes and problems of the policy of national reconciliation. He also emphasized the need for exchanges between such delegations, which promote the further strengthening and broadening of mutually advantageous Afghan-Soviet cooperation.

West Europe

Swedish Defense Minister Visits Military Sites

LD2509220490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1454 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow 25 September (TASS)—TASS correspondents Oleg Moskovskiy and Sergey Postanogov report:

"I think that the scope of ties between Sweden and the Soviet Union at various levels will increase," stated Roine Carlsson, Swedish Defense Minister who has arrived in the USSR on an official visit, in an interview with a TASS correspondent today.

Roine Carlsson today acquainted himself with a number of military sites in the Moscow region. He visited the air garrison in the small town of Kubinka, where he inspected the up-to-date aviation equipment on the ground and observed demonstration flights. In the second half of the day the Swedish defense minister visited the Guards Kantemir Tank Division. Roine Carlsson's attention was particularly drawn to the military equipment, and while inspecting it he was provided with detailed tactical and technical specifications about it and shown it in action.

"I have been impressed by my visit to the troop units," Roine Carlsson said after examining the Soviet military equipment. The Swedish defense minister also today met with pupils of the Military Academy of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and addressed them.

The program of Roine Carlsson's visit to the Soviet Union includes a visit to the town of Murmansk, where

he will acquaint himself with the Northern Fleet, and the city of Leningrad where he will also visit a number of military sites.

Ryzhkov Receives Swedish Industrialist

LD2609080390 Moscow TASS in English 0757 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov on Tuesday [25 Sep] received Hans Rausing, board chairman of the Swedish Tetra Pak concern, one of the world's largest producers of equipment and packing materials for agricultural products.

Rausing arrived in the Soviet Union to attend the launch of joint ventures producing vegetable and fruit juices in Lipetsk, central Russia, and automatic equipment for bottling and packing milk in Podolsk, Moscow region.

He shared his ideas and plans of using new technologies to produce packing materials for long storage and transportation of foodstuffs to cities and industrial centres.

Ryzhkov noted that cooperation between Soviet organisations and enterprises and the Tetra Pak company has achieved impressive results.

This is a promising start, since the two sides have a desire to expand their cooperation with the use of advanced technologies in the production of milk, juices, baby food and other foodstuffs.

The conversion of the Soviet munitions industry is creating additional opportunities for this cooperation, Ryzhkov said.

Yeltsin Cancels Planned Trip to Italy

AU2609090490 Rome ANSA in English 0822 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] (ANSA)—Rome—Boris Yeltsin, the president of the Russian Federation and leading Soviet radical, has canceled plans to visit Italy this month when he was to have been awarded the Capri Literary Prize and meet with Italian leaders.

A communique released by the organizers of the Capri prize said Yeltsin could not come to Italy due to complications arising from the automobile accident he had in Moscow a few days ago. It also said that the president and the secretary general of the prize committee would award Yeltsin the recognition in Moscow.

During his stay in Italy, Yeltsin was also to have met with Italian Premier Giulio Andreotti and Head of State Francesco Cossiga and was slated to be received at the Vatican by Pope John Paul II.

Supreme Soviet

Deputies To Discuss New Union Treaty 25 Sep

LD2509065190 Moscow TASS in English 0644 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—The Soviet parliament meeting began here today. The members of parliament will hear a report by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities, on consultations with representatives of the Union and autonomous republics and socio-political organisations on the elaboration of a new Union treaty. The consultations were held during the summer.

Representatives of 12 union republics formed a working group of the Soviet parliament and government. There were also meetings with delegations from the Baltic republics on their relationship with the USSR. The drafting of a new Union treaty was also discussed at a consultative meeting with the top officials of autonomous republics.

The current joint meeting is being attended by President Mikhail Gorbachev, members of the Presidential Council and the Soviet Government. A Japanese parliamentary delegation is present as guests.

Supreme Soviet 25 Sep Session Detailed

LD2509220190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1740 GMT on 25 September begins carrying a recorded relay with announcer interjections of the 25 September session of the USSR Supreme Soviet from the Moscow Kremlin.

Lukyanov announces at the beginning of the session that Gorbachev and Japanese MP's are present. Nishanov then reports on the progress of consultations about the drawing up of a new Union treaty.

At 1803 GMT Deputy Oleynik asks about the position of Solzhenitsyn in Soviet society. While acknowledging his authority as a moral guide of society, Oleynik has doubts about his political views. He goes on to quote other views about the future unity or disunity of the country. He criticizes some of Solzhenitsyn's views on the position of the Russian nation, which appear to be to the detriment of other nationalities.

At 1811 GMT Deputy Sharipov says that the future will be difficult.

At 1812 GMT Deputy Tarazevich talks about the formation of a free market, which will be difficult, but there is world experience to benefit from. The transition period will be particularly hard. He enumerates the difficulties expected. The disintegration of the Union would lead to great problems at factory level, he says.

At 1816 GMT Deputy Ayulbekov from Kazakhstan criticizes Solzhenitsyn's approach.

At 1817 GMT Deputy Borodin says the new treaty must include both internationalist and national elements. He asks why there are still autonomous and Union republics—second and first class entities. The media have long maintained that the USSR no longer exists, but he argues that this is not so. The state remains, but there is a weakness in the exercise of executive power: "a paralysis of power." The great danger is the continuation of the unitary nature of power in the country. The new treaty must preserve the true sovereignty of the individual and, by extension, of the individual republic. Careful thought must be given to the exact nature of the future state.

At 1823 GMT an announcer says that Gorbachev then spoke, noting that this was transmitted on the "Vremya" newscast.

At 1824 GMT after the interval, Deputy Komarov speaks about the importance of maintaining civilized standards.

At 1827 GMT Deputy Arzimov speaks about the "500 days" program's adverse implications for autonomous formations. They will preserve their present unequal status within the new arrangements. They will still depend on the Union republics. The USSR currently acts as a guarantor for the rights of the minority peoples, he notes.

At 1831 GMT Deputy Aypin says that self-determination is a necessary attribute of a free people. Fair representation must be ensured for indigenous peoples that are now minorities in their own autonomous formations. After listing other demands, he concludes with an appeal to everyone to pool their efforts to bring about a new Union.

At 1834 GMT the debate is gradually brought to a conclusion. After considering various proposed amendments, the session comes to a decision. A preparatory committee is to be set up to formulate the concept and first draft of the new Union treaty. The committee will consist of representatives of the Union republics and, particularly important, of autonomous formations, as well as the USSR president, the chairmen of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers, and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities. The committee will be established on 1 October.

The announcer notes that the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work in a joint sitting on 26 September.

Gorbachev Proposes New Name for Soviet Union

LD2509121290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 25 Sep 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In parliament today, during discussion of the new Union treaty, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev proposed a new name for the Soviet Union: the Union of Socialist Sovereign States [Soyuz Sotsialisticheskikh Suverennykh Gosudarstv]. Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, speaking at the Supreme Soviet, stated that two other options for the country's name have been proposed: the Union of Sovereign Socialist Republics [Soyuz Suverennykh Sotsialisticheskikh Respublic] and the Union of Euro-Asian Republics [Soyuz Yevro-Aziatskikh Respublic]

Union Treaty Discussion Leads to 'Heated' Debate

LD2509180490 Moscow TASS in English 1739 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow 25 September TASS—The discussion of a new union treaty, which began at this morning's plenary session of the Soviet Parliament, passed in a calm atmosphere, but after a break it grew heated. Emotions were stoked by representatives of union republics and autonomous entities, who voiced different and, at times, polarised views on prospects for the future state set-up.

Deputy from Estonia Klara Hallik recalled that it was not the first time during perestroyka that the question of drafting a new union treaty was raised. Earlier proposals, specifically those made by Estonia, were not, however, supported.

According to Hallik, 96-97 per cent of Estonians today regard the conclusion of the treaty as impossible and from a quarter to one third of non-Estonians "unequivocally support the restoration of the Estonian Republic's state independence."

Deputy from Latvia Viktor Alksnis also stridently opposed the new union treaty. But his rationale was different. According to Alksnis, the treaty "will give nothing," because it may only settle conflicts between the centre and republics and will not be able to prevent conflicts between republics and or ethnic clashes in republics. He called for the need to separate the powers of the union and the republics.

Deputy Yuriy Kalmykov dwelt at length on the republics' sovereignty. He noted that differences in the interpretation of the supremacy of the republican legislation over that of the union caused confusion in legislation. He said that the only way out of this situation was for the top leaders of the state and the republics to draft and sign the union treaty.

Deputy Vladislav Ardzinba addressed problems faced by autonomous entities. He criticised the programme of economic reforms drafted by academician Stanislav Shatalin and the presidential variant, because, according to him, they do not take into account autonomies' interests.

Ardzinba emphasised that the drafting and signing of the union treaty should involve the autonomies' plenipotentiary representatives.

Yuriy Shcherbak said that the new union treaty, "the present meaning of which was very unclear," was unpopular in the Ukraine. He noted that the idea of its early signing met with "some resistance" in several areas of the republic. One should not think that "this has been the working of a group of ill-wishing separatists," Shcherbak said.

"The idea of state sovereignty for the Ukraine has actually become a mass idea of salvaging the republic from economic collapse, ecological catastrophe and humiliation on the part of the omnipotent bureaucratic centre." Shcherbak doubted that the leadership of the country had a definite and clear-cut plan for the future state set-up.

The parliament adopted a resolution, assessing the future treaty as "a foundation for the drastic renewal of the union of Soviet socialist republics and an important factor of society's escape for the crisis."

The parliament adopted the Soviet president's proposal to form a committee to prepare a new union treaty.

Nationalities Chairman Speaks on Union Treaty

LD2509223690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1746 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Remarks by USSR Supreme Soviet Deputy Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities, at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 25 September—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The deputies listened to a report from Deputy Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, about the consultations on drafting the concept of a new Union treaty which took place during the summer with the representatives of the Union and autonomous republics and sociopolitical organizations.

[Nishanov] What are the main conclusions from the consultative meetings? First of all, let me note that on many questions a commonality of views and approaches was achieved. Although the process of the first consultations was complicated and the most contradictory judgements were expressed, the meetings showed a coincidence of points of view on the new image of the Union and the character of the mutual relations of its subjects, and also a multiplicity of forms and versions of the proposed content of the treaty and its concept and also the organization of the treaty process itself.

But one thing is beyond doubt, comrades: the participants in the consultative meetings managed to make considerable progress in understanding the historic

importance of the new Union treaty and the whole necessity of concluding it in a very short time, and in determining the key problems, directions and methods of further work.

A coincidence of views was establishd that a radical renewal of the Union is inescapable. Virtually everyone is agreed that it is essential to transform it radically on a democratic basis, to create a new union of sovereign states uniting the peoples on a voluntary, equal, and mutually advantageous basis.

From the proposed names of the new union, one can pick out the following three, although there were very many of them. The first is the one proposed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, to name our future union the Union of Sovereign Socialist States. The Kazakhstan delegation put forward a proposal to think about the following name: the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics. And one of the drafts which received the prize in the competition of the inter-regional group proposes to name our new union the Eurasian Union of Republics. There are many such proposals. We have a choice.

During the consultations, it was acknowledged that declarations or other acts which assert the state sovereignty of the Union and autonomous republics and also the laws adopted by the present USSR Supreme Soviet on questions of the national state structure and also those which we shall adopt in connection with the transition of our economy to market relations should become the departure point for initiating work at the talks. Stress was also laid on the importance of direct links between the republics which in the future should be developed and reflected in the Union treaty.

The conclusion of the new Union treaty was regarded unequivocally as a most urgent task, on the conclusion of which depends the fate of perestroyka, the historic prospects of our society, and getting it out of the state of crisis.

The results of the first pre-treaty stage of the consultations were examined at a joint sitting of the Council of the Federation of the USSR and the Presidential Council. Its participants gave a positive assessment of the work done and agreed to raise the preparatory processes to a higher level. A harmonization protocol has been drawn up, which has been approved by the leadership of the Union republics that took part in the consultations. A proposal has now been put forward by the USSR president and the USSR Federation Council for consideration by the the Supreme Soviet to set up a preparatory committee to elaborate a new Union treaty. It will consist of the top state officials of the republics, with the direct participation of the USSR president, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. I think that the Supreme Soviet will support this proposal.

Esteemed comrades, an analysis of the consultation materials, the ideas and propositions put forward by the Union and autonomous republics, and also the drafts which underwent competitive evaluation and were put forward to be judged by the general public show that we are now fully able to begin on the most complicated question: the concept of the new Union treaty.

Today we have in our hands dozens of draft treaties. Although there is not yet one that would adequately take account of the existing political, economic, and social situation and would satisfy the requirements of the various social and national forces, which would really preserve our state, and which would ensure equally for all peoples and citizens freedom, prosperity and security.

At present a harmonizing group is making efforts to bring together the proposals which have been made and which will be presented to the preparatory committee. Of course, a great deal of responsible work lies ahead, and our best minds and authorities should be drawn into this. The treaty can be drawn up only as the result of coordinated and skillful collective efforts.

At the same time, I would like to note that some basic positions are already being considered which after further elaboration could form the basis of the concept of a Union treaty and be reflected in its text.

First of all, in spite of contradictory opinions, almost everyone acknowledges the necessity of preserving state organization of public life. As opposed to an ethnic organization which has as its basis the interests of a specific nationality, most often the native one, the state expresses the interests of all citizens, the whole population of a territory and thus, by its very nature, is an international formation. From this point of view, the declarations adopted by the Union and some autonomous republics about state sovereignty are of great significance and demonstrate their readiness to defend in equal measure the rights and liberties of the citizens of all nationalities living on the corresponding territories.

Moreover, the republics' virtually identical approach to questions of the preservation and development of their statehood creates favorable prerequisites for state unification in the form of a union of sovereign soviet republics or states, depending on the name we give them. The clear and consistent assertion by the Union republics and now by the autonomous formations of their state sovereignty must be regarded as a historical fact independent of one's subjective attitude to it. This means that today it is not possible to resolve a single question against the will of the peoples of the republics or to counterbalance it. This applies all the more to the new Union treaty.

So a consensus with each people is necessary. Concrete practical conclusions follow from this. We can create a union only on new terms and in new forms which are based on the sovereignty of the republics, issue from it, and guarantee it.

Not everyone properly appreciates yet the responsibility that is conferred by the status of full sovereignty. The sovereignty of republics presupposes that it must be

exercised not only on the level of republics, but also in the Union as a whole. The state sovereignty of each republic naturally depends on their absolute equality, the compulsory taking account of each other's interests, and the common concern for citizens' rights and freedoms. Proceeding from the state sovereignty of republics, it is clearly necessary to concern oneself not only with the transfer of certain functions and powers to the Union, to Union bodies, but also with questions of joint authority in which their common interests are represented. It is clear that sovereign states can tackle all questions by themselves. Nevertheless, there are a number of areas of public activity that are either already so integrated that they cannot be divided into parts, or they simply cannot be dealt with by each individual republic, or they are too expensive to conduct separately.

In the process of consultations and discussions, with the use of massive information, a group of questions is being identified at present. In our view these questions are common to the interests of all the republics and may be delegated to the Union or to a joint authority within the framework of a renewed Union. These might be regarded as including: First, ensuring the freedom, sovereignty and security of all republics and peoples, which presupposes building up the Armed Forces, defending the borders, state security, a defense industry; second, forming a civil society, establishing its institutions, and protecting the rights and freedoms of the citizens; third, founding a common economic and legal entity. A Union-wide market is still impossible. This question, to which universal attention is now being drawn, is highly topical for practically all the peoples within our vast country; fourth, meeting the requirements of all republics for power and mineral resources, since their sources are unevenly distributed among the regions; fifth, ensuring the movement of people and the conveyance of goods, which presupposes a common communications service—meaning rail, air, sea, trunk-road and pipeline transport, and the use of river routes; sixth, creating conditions for scientific and technical progress; specifically, space and nuclear research and the free exchange of information, including in the field of education, culture, health care and all areas of everyday life; seventh, preserving the natural environment, solving common ecological problems, and overcoming natural disasters and technological accidents; and, eighth, ensuring foreign-policy and external economic interests, participating in international organizations, observing treaties, and maintaining the country's international authority and its role in strengthening peace and security throughout the world.

Needless to say, comrades, individual republics have their own approaches, their own recommendations, regarding the problems under discussion, since they possess different degrees of feasibility. But one cannot fail to see in these and other questions a unifying principle, which it is highly expedient to utilize.

In connection with the preparation of a treaty, questions of the mechanisms, structures, forms, and methods in the running of Union affairs are coming more actively to the fore. Concern is particularly noticeable here, since, if anything has played a negative role in the development of the Union in the past, it is the centrist, authoritarian, and bureaucratic deformations.

The building of the USSR on a fundamentally new, qualitative basis as a Union of sovereign states means, alongside the maximum guaranteeing of rights and the strengthening of their sovereignty, the preservation and strengthening of the USSR as an integral, multinational formation. In this connection, many delegations have spoken to the effect that the question of the extent of the powers that are transferred to the USSR by the participants in a Union treaty must be carefully and responsibly settled.

Various proposals are being expressed about the legislative, executive, and judicial power of the Union. I should like to acquaint you with some of them. Some are inclined toward creating a Supreme Soviet of the Union as a truly professional parliament with direct representation within it of the republics that are parties to the treaty. Also, proposals have been voiced about the need to ponder more deeply, and to change the electoral system so that members of all the peoples living in the Soviet Union are represented in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The idea has also been expressed that a broader, weightier, and more executive character should be imparted to the president's power. At the same time, recognition is given to the need to preserve and activate the work of the Council of Ministers.

Considerable disagreement also exists over the judicial system—specifically, over its functions in the field of constitutional supervision. The proposal was tabled, for example, that the Constitutional Compliance Committee should be transformed into a constitutional court. If any issues arise between the parties to the Union treaty, between the republics and the Union, then there should be a decision by the constitutional court, which will possess a uniquely supreme power.

On the whole, comrades, these important issues, which are of fundamental significance to the organization and functioning of the future renewed Union, give us something to think about and something to work out. I think that to do this we can spare neither effort, time, nor energy.

I should like to draw your attention to another issue. Preparation of a new Union treaty is a problem which is worrying not only Soviet people but also many countries abroad and wide circles of the world public. We are receiving many letters, whose authors are concerned about the state of affairs in interethnic relations and about the weakening of our statehood. You see, for almost three centuries, the Russian state before the revolution and the USSR after it had been established, played an extremely responsible role as a world power in the development of the international situation. This role

may, of course, be appraised in various ways. But no one is entitled to deny its weight. To the present day the USSR is included in all relationships guaranteeing world order and the stability of world economic links. We possess a great reserve of nuclear missile weapons as well as powerful armed forces which are to a large extent a guarantor of peace and international security. The destruction of the Union might destroy everything that has been created through enormous labor by the United Nations during the whole period since World War II. Every Soviet person should therefore reflect on where we are going and what we are heading toward, and what union we are creating. There can be no illusions or hoping for the off-chance in politics. And so, comrades, let us look at tomorrow with open eyes and make a prognosis on what will become of all of us if there is no renewed and strong union. However great the degree of our dissatisfaction at the current situation, including the system of the state structure, we cannot permit ourselves another gigantic sociopolitical experimentation upon the destiny of millions of people. I think that we do not have the right to hastily implement ideas of statehood which may be externally attractive but which do not take account of the territorial-demographic, historico-cultural and economic realities of our huge country. We can and should break with the unworthy past and give the cultural diversity and originality of our peoples their due, as well as their inalienable rights and interests, but we cannot permit new resettlements of peoples, we cannot place hundreds of thousands of people in a tragic situation.

And finally. The USSR Supreme Soviet is not drawing up and is not ratifying a Union treaty. This is the affair of the republics. A draft will be worked out by a preparatory committee which will include the highest statesmen and officials of the republics and the Union, but each people's deputy of the USSR has been elected from a definite territorial or national-territorial constituency. In this way public organizations express the interests and will of many people. This means that none of us can remain aloof from this truly fateful action, irrespective of his political views and personal sympathies. All of us are called upon to take up a clear position and to use our authority in the cause of creating new democratic and humane interethnic relations. All of us, including people's deputies of the Union and the republics and of local soviets, have to carry out complex and responsible work, the essence of which lies in determining choices and paths of development not only for the present generation but also for many generations to come. And a consciousness of this lofty responsibility to dispose people toward peaceful agreement, toward toleration and readiness to compromise, as well as a primary concern for improving the living conditions and security of citizens—these are the initial conditions and values which should lie at the basis of all our actions. We simply do not have the right to engage in ill-considered or ambitious actions, as a result of which, instead of resolving problems and emerging from political impasses, grounds for fresh injustices and fresh violence might be laid.

Working out the treaty and creating a new union is not just a multilateral, collective political act. It is a historic event, and this means that all of us together and each of us individually is answerable to history, to the multimillion and multi-ethnic Soviet people, and to our descendants.

Solzhenitsyn Article Receives 'Hostile Reception'

LD2509135290 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—The Soviet parliament today discussed the preparation of a new union treaty.

Deputies turned on an article entitled "how we should remake Russia" by Nobel Prize winning dissident writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn. The article was published last week by the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper and the influential LITERATURNAYA GAZETA weekly.

Many parliamentarians gave a hostile reception to the article. Deputy chairman of the Soviet parliament's Council of Nationalities Boris Oleynik said the writer's slighting tone with respect to some nations of the Soviet Union "belittle their national dignity and could lead to separatism".

Yerkin Auyelbekov from Kazakhstan said Solzhenitsyn's remarks concerning the Kazakh people were "insulting" and noted that the Soviet president and the parliament should express their opinion of the article.

President Mikhail Gorbachev said the article and the author's personality call for a "serious analysis". Gorbachev said as a politician he rejects Solzhenitsyn's views, because the writer "lives entirely in the past" and his views "on a future for our multiethnic state" are unacceptable.

Later in the day, chairman of the Council of Nationalities Rafik Nishanov reported on the elaboration of a new union treaty. During the discussion that followed, deputies spoke against splitting the country into several independent states.

Deputy Georgiy Tarazevich said the break-up of the union could have serious economic consequences in conditions of the transition to market relations. Supporting him, deputy Yuriy Sharipov noted that "the transition to market relations is possible only in the country as a whole", and the "disintegration of the economic mechanism opposes the interests of economic stability of any of union republics".

Yuriy Borodin, chairman of the parliament's Committee for Health Protection, said the Soviet Union, like other federative states, should have its federal territory and a capital, "which might not coincide with the capital of a union republic".

During the break in the morning session, President Gorbachev met a visiting Japanese parliamentary delegation.

Gorbachev Criticizes Solzhenitsyn's Political Views

LD2509205290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Remarks by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 25 September; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] I can already say in advance today that as far as I am concerned the choice was made a long time ago and forever. I am for a union of sovereign states, a renewed union, where all peoples should feel well and where each nation should realize its intellectual potential and everything that is inherent in every people—and every people are unique and great in their own way. I see this union of sovereign states as a unified, multinational state. Here, then, are the dialectics of this understanding of mine.

Now, as for the publication in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA of Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn's brochure—this is what it is called, yes—I would like to be brief. It deserves very serious analysis, appraisal, and reflection. The brochure requires it and the character of the author requires serious analysis. I will confine myself here merely to the intial reaction on this score. Let me say outright that having read and annotated this text twice and having reflected on all this, I experienced and was gripped and am still gripped by very contradictory feelings. I hope that you too experienced this. I am even convinced that this is precisely the case.

As a Russian I accept the pain and the concerns for the fate of the Russian people and the fate of Russia. I accept these fully and I can say, on my own behalf, that I too have already had occasion to speak of this. At the same time, however, as a Russian I definitely cannot agree with Aleksandr Isayevich's stance on other peoples. When all is said and done it lacks respect and this is appraising it in the very mildest way. I cannot agree with that. Some people here recall their roots and the environment in which they grew up and matured. I was born and I grew up in the Northern Caucasus and it is well known what country it is and how many people live there. It includes our renowned Dagestan—I nearly said with Rasul Gamzatov at the head [laughter]—but it would not have been a great mistake. [laughter] When, while distributing languages around the world, God saw that he had already flown everywhere, to all places, and that all the peoples had been taken care of, he threw out everything that was left over. And lo and behold each ravine there has an ethnic group of its own: 35 peoples live there. This, then is the environment in which I grew up and matured.

At the same time my roots on my mother's side are in Chernigov and on my father's in Voronezh. This is the situation, you understand. [laughter in hall] This is what we are, and we are all like this because it is our country. It has gone through centuries and this is how it is. For that reason I stand by the position that I always have: To walk over human destinies, around this land and to try to divide it and delimit it using patterns, or even scissors of some sort, or a plough is not only...[changes thought] It is the most profound error, and an intolerable one, and we have already felt this. You know that only 30 percent of our borders were established by state acts. All the rest were determined by local bodies and the people are living there and do not even know that. If we proclaim this now and start on the borders, we will not make any further progress. That is the last thing we need.

For this reason I cannot agree with this position. Each of us Russians has a genetically determined perception of our country in all its scale, vastness, and diversity of language, culture, people, and aspects. We are all like this, and we feel fine in this country. This is how we grew up. No negative complexes arise within us. And if they do, it is because throughout history, along with everything that has happened, not only during the past decade but over centuries, problems have accumulated to which democratic answers were not found in good time, and they have not been resolved. This is something we must do. This is the way it is, this is the way it is.

I think there is no controvery over whether we should return to the guberniyas [provinces] of Tsarist Russia. No. And I share the stance of Ilyich who fought to his last breath so that after the revolution each people in this country should feel free and look to the future with confidence. So I think our path is the true one. We must calmly and responsibly think everything through and take everything to its conclusions. I am certain we are already approaching our aim despites all the pain, tragedies, and losses—both losses and victims—that have already occurred.

Solzhenitsyn's political views are alien to me as a politician. He is all in the past, the Russia of the past, the Tsarist monarchy. This for me is unacceptable. I feel myself to be a democrat and moreover inclined, so to speak, inclined toward radical views both for today and for the future. But this does not hinder me. Indeed it helps me to combine them with the great responsibility and prudence which I believe I must display, in the role which I have found myself because you willed it. That is why I think that you understand. His views on the future of our multinational state are unacceptable to me as a politician. These views are removed from reality and he constructs a lot outside the context in which the country finds itself and how it has taken shape. And I will say

more: These views on the whole—their substance, if one looks into it—are of a destructive nature, a destructive nature.

You understand, there are many very interesting arguments, very profound thoughts, very well-observed trends grasped by this nevertheless undoubtedly great man. This does not redeem his brochure as a whole inasmuch as, for the most part, there is a very great deal of what I, for instance, cannot accept.

At today's stage—this is my last opinion as a politician—I see a new role and a new responsibility for the Russian Federation and the Russian people. I am obliged to phrase it like this because the Russian Federation is not just the Russian people but dozens of peoples, hundreds of peoples. And I see this new role and new responsibility.

And I think—sometime ago I said that the greatest danger is if we lead Russia in the wrong direction. There have long been attempts to destabilize it. This has been slipped in from all sides. There it is. But I am certain all the same in this case and this time. The Russian Federation and Russians, wherever they may live, will prove to be true to internationalism, friendship, cooperation, and that same openness, demonstrating all those riches and potential of the Russian soul which they possess. And I pronounce this with pride, following Dostoyevskiy. It is in keeping with him, although it is not a quotation.

The heart of a Russian is more open than other peoples' to brotherhood, cooperation, and so on. I confirm that this is also the case today, although there are existing grudges and new ones have appeared. I think we will overcome them, we will cast it all aside. We are on the right path.

Gorbachev Aide Views Need for 'Emergency' Powers

LD2509140390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] [Announcer] A news conference was held in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center today. It was mainly concerned with the keen debate in the USSR Supreme Soviet over the past few days. Aides of the USSR president spoke to the journalists. Here is our correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy:

[Ruvinskiy] I remind our listeners that the Supreme Soviet has adopted a law on additional measures to stabilize economic and sociopolitical affairs in the country, granting the USSR president the right to promptly issue decrees of a normative nature until 31 March 1992. In other words, in essence, some of the functions of the USSR Supreme Soviet have been transferred.

The Supreme Soviet was also supposed to make a choice during these last few days—a choice of our economic strategy. This choice turned out to be half-hearted, since the president will still have the final say.

Asked who won and who lost, the president's aide Nikolay Yakovlevich Petrakov stated that the winners were the president and the government and the loser was the Supreme Soviet. So it transpires that even this is possible, despite the fact that the government is, as you know, subordinate to the Supreme Soviet. Preference was given to none of the programs submitted by the president, the Shatalin group, and the government. As Petrakov put it, it was a dead heat. And here is how he described proceedings in our parliament:

[Begin Petrakov recording] As far as our deputies are concerned, I think they have shown incompetence here and an unwillingness to assume responsibility. This is not the best of positions, I would say, since it is they who must be more socially active, and in this the president has set an example by assuming, without hesitation, the responsibility and consequently all the criticism that might ensue.

Why does the president need emergency powers? Not to impose martial law or presidential rule of course. Incidentally, the reaction from the Presidium of the Russian Supreme Soviet was very surprising. It was a reaction to nothing more than rumors and quite incommensurate with what was happening in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The president needs emergency powers in order to implement the rapid economic reforms. In other words, the Supreme Soviet has demonstrated its inability to act over these last few days, while self-critically handing over some of its powers to the president. This is very important because in the course of an energetic economic policy—which is precisely what we have not had so far—rapid operational decisions must be adopted. Some issues will have to be resolved in one, two, or three days and decisions made instantly concerning various financial issues, for example, changes in price policy and budget policy. And if parliament were to be assembled every time and each issue debated for weeks, this would simply be inefficient and might destroy the entire fabric of the reforms. So this is why emergency powers are needed and that is all there is to it. It is because the presidential team has to work promptly and quickly, as I said earlier. [end recording]

Economic Decrees Already Prepared

LD2509154790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1355 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov from the USSR Foreign Ministry press center]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Sep (TASS)—The USSR president needs the emergency powers granted to him by the USSR Supreme Soviet "exclusively to carry out rapid economic reforms" in the Soviet Union and not for any other aims, for example, the imposition of martial law or a transition to presidential rule. This was stated by Nikolay Petrakov, aide to the head of the Soviet state, speaking here

today within the framework of a regular briefing by the press service of the USSR president.

The USSR Supreme Soviet, he stressed, "has demonstrated its inability to function over the last few days" and "is self- critically handing over some of its powers to the president." In the words of Nikolay Petrakov, this is very important because during the switch to a market in the country and to a vigorous policy of economic reform, "quick, urgent" and sometimes "instant decisions" have to be taken, for example, in the area of price and budget policy.

Commenting on the outcome of discussion of the issue of the country's transition to a market economy, the aide to the head of state described its results as "a victory" for the president and the union government, and "a defeat" for the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In answer to a question of whether attempts were being made to unite the Academician Shatalin program with that of the government, Nikolay Petrakov said that the programs are "philosophically, fundamentally opposed" to one another. He said that the president's program gives particular attention to stabilizing measures which are understood "above all as a rigorous financial policy and the policy of strengthening the ruble and control over the mass of money." "As for the government's position," he said, "they are not bothered by issues of money. That is evident from their program, where they are prepared to pay the population massive amounts in compensation. It is evident too in today's practice where the government has, from the very best motives, decided to waive debts on loans from the 1950's as an emergency [measure]." "There are fundamental differences," Petrakov stressed, "but there is a whole series of points which have come closer: privatization, the creation of joint stock companies, management cadre training."

Nikolay Petrakov reported that there is already "a packet of presidential decrees on economic policies." He did not begin to enumerate them however, on the grounds that "the actual program has not yet been endorsed and the decrees are very closely linked to its being endorsed." He merely added that the decrees will relate "precisely to stabilizing measures in the area of money and financial policies."

In answer to a question about what or who "forced" the president "even at the cost of open confrontation" with the Russian Supreme Soviet and placing "under threat the accords reached with Boris Yeltsin" to defend the government, the USSR president's aide said: "I do not think anyone forced the president. He is a fairly determined person, and you must understand that there are certain fears regarding the consequences of a government crisis. The point does not lie in changing the government. What is important is who is to carry out the economic policy needed in the period of reform." "The Russian parliament," he said, "has simply made the situation more charged."

President's Additional Powers Detailed

LD2509200390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Soviet Union, as a state, has taken the first step toward a market economy. The adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of the law on supplementary measures to stabilize the country's economic and sociopolitical life has become the main event of the day.

In accordance with this law, the USSR Supreme Soviet delegates to the country's president, until 31 March 1992—I quote from the law—the rights to issue, on an ad hoc basis, decrees which have the force of law and to issue instructions with regard to ownership issues, the organization of national economy management, the budget and financial system, the remuneration for work and pricing, and also with regard to strengthening law and order. However, this pertains to instances when the USSR Supreme Soviet does not deem it necessary to establish other regulations, or when it does not recommend to the president that he should alter or rescind the decisions adopted by him.

In other words, the point at issue is the granting to the head of state of additional powers for the period of the country's transition to the market economy.

Deputies View Gorbachev, Government Programs

LD2509160390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Remarks by USSR Supreme Soviet Deputies Popov and Ryabchenko at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 24 September; presented by correspondent Nikiforov on the "Supreme Soviet Diary" program—recorded]

[Text] [Nikiforov] The main controversy over the draft decision arose in the section stating that both the draft submitted by the president and that submitted by the government are to be taken as a basis for further work. Here is what Deputy Popov thought on the subject:

[Popov] The first issue we need to be totally clear on is how the two programs are to be combined. There can be no equal combination of the two programs, as any economic specialist will tell you straight away. So when the draft program [as heard] states "on the basis of the two programs" this is, in effect, evading the issue. Either the country's Supreme Soviet makes a fundamental decision defining work or else, in effect, it evades the issue. An unambiguous decision must be noted; the program of the country's president must be taken as a basis and those components of the government program that fit into it should be incorporated. Any other decision would mean either, I repeat, evading the issue or, in effect, complicating the work to be done by the commission the president has appointed.

My second point: The second thing is that in my view the program to be adopted is so complex and crucial that it can be... the program to be adopted by the country can only be the Gorbachev-Yeltsin program. Only if the program bears the signatures of the two leading figures in our perestroyka can the people believe in it and begin fulfilling it, working on it, and so on. Any other option in this respect would mean, I think, once again evading the issue. And the final point concerns the mechanism for the fulfillment of the program and, in this connection, the issue of emergency powers. Personally, I think there should not be emergency powers, but normal long-overdue changes to the country's Constitution providing for and forming an executive authority and allowing it to begin functioning normally. Without this executive authority, without enshrining its powers in this Constitution, we shall not fulfill this program in view of all its complexity. Therefore, it would be completely wrong to make do with some sort of emergency powers and so on; we must change the Constitution, and as soon as possible. And in this connection it seems to me that the issue of changing the mechanism of power should be immediately resolved on adoption of the plan. Any changes to the mechanism before it is decided how functions are to be distributed between the Union and the republics and how future work is to be organized, any attempt in itself to decide this in advance without the plan, would be premature and quite simply dangerous.

Summing up, I believe that this draft decision must be amended in the various ways I have mentioned. The most important of these amendments are first, that the president's plan must be adopted as a basis and be enriched by the other plans, and second, that a program of reform of executive power must be prepared as a logical continuation of the plan to be adopted.

[Nikiforov] Giving practical support to that speech, Deputy Ryabchenko put forward a specific proposal for a vote.

[Ryabchenko] When we were discussing the decisions of the commissions and committees, all of them with the exception of one decision, gave preference to the president's draft as a basis. The wording here contradicts the materials from the committees and commissions and takes us back to square one. In other words, it appears that all the work we have done is now undone, and we are again getting bogged down into placing the fundamental differences between the two drafts on a par. I want to put forward a specific proposal on the text of Point 1, taking into account both the decisions of the committees and Commissions and the debate here. In Point 1, after the words "submitted by the USSR president," we should write "taking into account the draft program submitted by the Council of Ministers," and then continue as written. This is the first proposal and I would ask you to vote on it. The general vote on Popov's proposal does not supercede this.

Second, I would like to point out another fundamental difference between the president's and the government programs, which was, I think, discussed in the committees and commissions, and we too must find the courage to take a definite stance. The cardinal difference between the two programs is the relationship between the power and prerogatives of the center and the republics. The president's program entrusts a substantial role and responsibility to the republics, while the Council of Ministers' program keeps the leading role for the center. These are two deep-rooted contradictions, and instead of hiding our faces, we must state whether this is the case or not.

Shatalin Presents Draft Economic Decision 24 Sep

LD2509133990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Sep 90

["Excerpt" of speech by Academician Stanislav Shatalin, USSR Presidential Council member, at the 24 September USSR Supreme Soviet meeting in the Kremlin; from the "USSR Supreme Soviet Diary" program—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent Nikiforov] Academician Shatalin felt it necessary to explain his stance on this issue [the economic program]. Moreover, Stanislav Sergeyevich [Shatalin] submitted to the deputies a draft decision of his own. Bet let us not get ahead of ourselves. Here is an excerpt from his speech.

[Shatalin] Let us recall what happened. The president's program was officially submitted along with two accompanying programs—the government's and that of the working group set up under the direction of Gorbachev and Yeltsin. Therefore, first, when stating that the deputies and only the deputies of the Supreme Soviet can make a choice, (?one thing is clear)—that even the Supreme Soviet cannot combine Maxwell's Equation and Ohm's Law. Do not get me wrong, comrades. I do not want to put any pressure on you. The situation is a reality and economics is a science too. There can be no compromise between the government program and the program of the president and the Shatalin group [applause]. I do not want to take part in a show. I want absolute precision and clarity.

I think, therefore... I have also prepared a draft of my own; (?like the session) preparing not just a program but a draft too. Allow me to read it out.

First, we should approve completely the program for transition to a market economy in the USSR submitted by the USSR president. Second, we should ask USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to head a commission—not a working group—to finalize the program, consisting of Abalkin, Aganbegyan [word indistinct], Petrakov, Fedorov, Shatalin, Yavlinskiy, and [word indistinct], and include in that commission empowered representatives of the Union republics. Finalization of the program should take into account proposals by the working group headed by Academician S.S. Shatalin—by me, that is—as set up by USSR President Gorbachev, Soviet Chairman Yeltsin, USSR

Council of Ministers Chairman Ryzhkov, and RSFSR government chairman Silayev.

Third, as of 15 October 1990 we should begin implementation of the program. Which means [words indistinct] if you still trust the president—so that he can begin implementing the program. Otherwise, we shall spend another whole month on this.

And the final point: it is considered urgent that the USSR president adopt a decree on the drawing up of a plan of economic and social development of the USSR for 1990-91, taking into account the urgency of this measure.

[Nikiforov] One might say that passions in the assembly hall had reached a climax. And in this situation many deputies saw a way out of the situation in what Deputy Shcherbak proposed:

[Shcherbak] I am afraid that we today in the Supreme Soviet are going to commit a historic and fateful error. In the words of Pasternak, I urge everyone to open the window and see what century it is outside, what is happening in the country. For that reason, I agree with Stanislav Sergeyevich Shatalin's proposal, but for that we should not call a vote now but immediately put together a commission, adopt the Shatalin program as a basis, not place the president's and the government programs on a par but support the president's program, create a new document and put it to a vote after the break.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Greets All-Union Pioneer Rally

LD2509141490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] We have received Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's greetings to the delegates of the 20th all-Union pioneer rally. The telegram says that for the first time in the entire history of the children's and pioneers' movement in our country, you have embarked upon a radical restructuring of your organization, embarked upon it without any orders or pressure from other questions. More initiative and less fear of making mistakes! In setting out in search of the new do not forget to take with you the best traditions of the pioneers.

The telegram expresses wishes for warm love for the fatherland and the native area, and for eternal aspiration to good and justice.

Ignatenko Holds Briefing on Gorbachev's Agenda

LD2509154990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1434 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Sep (TASS)—All this week, USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev is "completely absorbed in matters being discussed at the USSR Supreme Soviet—the transition to the market and the stabilization of economic processes." This was stated by Vitaliy Ignatenko, aide to the president and head of his press service, at a regular briefing here today. He added that all the head of state's meetings with academics, workers, people's deputies, and foreign visitors are devoted or related to this area. In his words, he is maintaining constant contact with republican leaders as the Union treaty is being discussed.

The head of the press service reported that the USSR president attended a meeting yesterday between Kazakh President Nazarbayev and specialists, at which matters relating to the implementation of major projects on the territory of that Central Asian republic were discussed. Today, Mikhail Gorbachev had a conversation with Japanese political figures during the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, he added.

Vitaliy Ignatenko confirmed that the president plans a tour of the country; however, he could not be precise about the route.

Newsmen were interested in the reasons why Mikhail Gorbachev ordered a special investigation to be held into the case of the murder of the priest Aleksandr Men. Vitaliy Ignatenko said the president "felt this loss very acutely." "The presidential order," he added, "was based only on the fact that this was a very significant figure and that the reverberation in society was very acute. Many people still think it was a political murder." The chief of the head of state's press service also expressed the opinion that in this case "one must trust the investigation," the results of which will be announced.

Journalists also asked about Mikhail Gorbachev's attitude to the "persecution" of Valeriya Novodvorskaya for insulting the president of the USSR. "The president did not display any interest in this situation," Vitaliy Ignatenko said, adding that the actions regarding Novodvorskaya were the "initiative of the law enforcement bodies" and that "the apparatus of the president is not watching this case".

Going on to issues of foreign policy, Vitaliy Ignatenko said concerning Iraq's actions against Kuwait: "We are wholly in favor of everything being resolved in the framework of the UN resolutions." He expressed the option that today, when Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs, is chairing the UN Security Council, "sanctions will be reinforced and extended to the skies." The Soviet president's aide evaluated this as "a sufficient response for today to the intentions and statements" of President Saddam Husayn.

Vitaliy Ignatenko confirmed that Mikhail Gorbachev will visit France in the second half of October this year.

Replying to a question about the possible restoration of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel, Vitaliy Ignatenko expected that events in this matter will develop to match development of the situation in the whole of the Near East region—"the better the situation there, the more quickly this very major issue will also be tackled." The head of the presidential press service spoke in favor of holding an international conference on the Near East as soon as possible which, he said, "would help to resolve this issue as well" and at which the Palestinian problem and many other problems of the region would be tackled "as a whole."

Adviser Petrakov Reviews Gorbachev's New Powers

AU2509194390 Paris AFP in English 1509 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 25 (AFP)—The special powers granted to President Mikhail Gorbachev to implement the passage to a market economy do not mean he will introduce a state of emergency or direct presidential rule in the Soviet Union, his economic adviser said Tuesday.

"The exceptional powers are aimed at carrying out economic reform," the adviser, Nikolay Petrakov told a news conference.

Mr. Gorbachev's priorities would be "privatisation, the setting up of limited companies, and the training of officials and managers," he said.

Mr. Petrakov refused to give any indication of how many presidential decrees might be issued, but said that early moves would be linked to financial and budget issues.

"There is nothing behind the powers" granted to Mr. Gorbachev by the Soviet parliament Monday and they were "certainly not aimed at introducing a state of emergency or direct presidential administration," he added.

"That is why the reaction of the parliament of the Russian Republic was a complete surprise and wrong-headed," Mr. Petrakov said.

The parliament of Russia, the largest Soviet Republic, had said Saturday that Mr. Gorbachev's request for special powers to handle economic reform was unacceptable.

Mr. Petrakov noted that Monday's decision by the Soviet parliament to give Mr. Gorbachev special powers until March 1992 to carry out economic reform came after the parliament had "shown its incompetence" in failing to reach a decision on what economic programme to follow.

"Decisions must be taken swiftly. To discuss every question for weeks on end is not efficient," he said.

The parliament voted the special powers to Mr. Gorbachev after failing to reach agreement on which reform programme to follow.

It faced the choice between a radical programme supported by Mr. Gorbachev and a far more moderate proposal put forward by the government, which has threatened to resign rather than implement the radical reforms.

Asked what programme Mr. Gorbachev would now adopt, Mr. Petrakov, who helped draft the more radical alternative, said simply that "the two programmes are irreconcilable."

The parliament has called for implementing a compromise solution drawing on both proposals.

"The president's programme lays particular emphasis on the stabilisation of the ruble, while... the government is not worried about printing money, that is how they mean to compensate the people" for the cost of reform, Mr. Petrakov said.

Asked if the government was likely to resign, Mr. Petrakov said "we must change the government and know who will be able to implement a good economic policy."

"But we must think long and hard before doing anything," he added, saying that the Russian Federation parliament's call for Soviet Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzhkov to step down "helped worsen the situation."

Deputy Golik Comments on Presidential Powers

LD2509215790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Interview with Yuriy Golik, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, by correspondent Sergey Lomakin; from the "Vremya" newscast—live in the studio]

[Text] [Lomakin] Of course our program does not lay claim to give an in-depth sociological analysis. However, I know that many people hold different opinions. This is obviously happening due to a lack of information. As is known, a lack of information gives rise to rumors and many people do not yet know the provisions of that law [law on additional measures to stabilize the economic and sociopolitical life of the country] themselves. And well, to say nothing of the fact that even journalists make mistakes. This morning a flagrant error was made in the "120 Minutes" program, and other mass media are interpreting this law incorrectly too. Therefore, we have invited to the studio Yuriy Vladimorovich Golik, an author of that law, and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Issues of Legislation, Legality and Law and Order, and asked him to comment on this law.

[Golik] I think that the simplest and most effective way of getting acquainted with the law is to take the text of the law and to read it. I hope that this law will be published in all the newspapers tomorrow. And, well, I would recommend in reading the law that attention be drawn to some clauses [pozitsiya], there are just five of

them. What are these clauses? The aim, the reason why this law is being adopted, is indicated—with the aim of stabilizing the situation in the country.

The means are indicated—the right granted to the president to urgently issue decrees which have the force of law in accordance with the constitution. This is novel, let's put it like that, for our legislation. There is a clearly defined time limit for the operation of this law—until 31 March 1992. There is here a clear enumeration of the lines along which the USSR Supreme Soviet delegates its powers for this period to the president. There are several of them—on the question of ownership relations, the organization and management of the national economy, the budget and finance system, the payment of labor, price fixing, and the reinforcement of law and order. And finally there is also here a form of control by the Supreme Soviet over the decrees issued by the president, and over the instructions issued by the president.

[Lomakin] Well, obviously our country is not the first to go through that whole sphere. Well, as far as I know, in its time, the U.S. Congress delegated to President Roosevelt extraordinary powers when he was leading the country out of the Great Depression, as far as I know. After all, a country needs strong authority at such a time.

[Golik] You are quite right. But well, again, sticking to the paths already taken by your journalist colleagues who have begun to speak of the extraordinary powers, there is not even a mention of extraordinary powers here. It is a question here only of the delegation of a part, of just a very small part, of the powers of the Supreme Soviet. Moreover, the Supreme Soviet fully retains these powers and may intervene at any moment. But this practice exists throughut the whole world, anywhere there is a president and a parliament. And it has never taken the shape of something extraordinary or unusual for the state. A great deal depends on the parliament and the forms of parliamentary control [kontrol] over the activities of the president. But I hope that our parliament, our USSR Supreme Soviet, is experienced enough in these questions.

[Lomakin] Nevertheless, people see the main danger in this law in that it may, well, present a threat to the sovereignty of the republics. After all, sovereignty was gained through much suffering, if we can put if directly that way. Is there not the threat of this in that?

[Golik] I would put it this way: There is a threat to the sovereignty of the republics at present, but it comes from the republics themselves, and in no way from the USSR Supreme Soviet, and not from the president. I am referring to those declarations adopted in haste, I mean in haste with regard to speed, not with regard to the elaboration of legislative clauses, the declarations of sovereignty which practically all the Union republics have adopted. Both the republics themselves and the citizens of these republics are already trying not to refer to certain norms of these declarations. Our time is too dynamic.

[Lomakin] Thank you, Yuriy Vladimirovich for coming to our studio, despite the shortage of time. Thank you.

[Golik] I will leave you the text of the law as a souvenir.

[Lomakin] Thank you.

Deputies 'Fail to Understand' Rival Programs

PM2509153390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by R. Lynev under the rubric "On Issues of the Day": "Between Rapture and Suspicion"]

[Text] On Monday, 24 September, the country's parliament made a decision that strikes many people as double-edged: On the one hand, to rely in the future on the draft economic reform created on the initiative of Yeltsin and Gorbachev—the "presidential draft." And, on the other hand, to utilize all the best that is contained not only in it but also in the draft submitted by the government.

At the same time the parliamentarians had to examine the question of granting the USSR president additional powers to accelerate the introduction of the market mechanism.

Both these decisions alarmed people who are radically and democratically minded. The first because of its attempt, as they viewed it, to delay the departure of N.I. Ryzhkov and his cabinet and to find a compromise where one can no longer be found. The second, on the contrary—and this seems most suspicious—because of M.S. Gorbachev's reluctance to linger and wait for the necessary laws for the market to pass through parliament, and his wish to introduce them directly—through his presidential power.

Well, really, is there not a contradiction here? And if there is, what lies behind it? A desire to combine (to "consolidate"!) what is incompatible? An attempt to tack between obsolete structures and the need to replace them urgently?

Alas, the course of the debate at the USSR Supreme Soviet and, even more so, Saturday's statement by the Russian Parliament clearly attest that the parliamentarians not only fail to understand each other in the situation that has arisen but fail to understand that precisely radical measures and the strengthening of executive power are needed to radically extricate the economy from the crisis. It seems that relatively few parliamentarians have read that place in the presidential draft elaborated under the leadership of Academician S.S. Shatalin which states that **from the very first days of the period of transition to the market the president must regulate the process by means of his direct acts**. Such acts will be required in the very near future—maybe even before the final version of the program has been adopted. After all, have we not approached that extreme point where a practical step forward, as a classical author said, is more important than 1,000 programs?

But even this is not everything. It should be remembered that the present, presidential version of the program dates back to March, when the "400 days" draft came into being deep within the government commission on economic reform. It was a draft designed to enable the head of state to assume all the necessary powers right then, in the spring, and to create a strong, harmonious team which would decisively turn the country toward the market. It was designed to enable the Presidential Council not to be a branch of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo but to include representatives of the broad democratic public—and then, it has to be thought, we would have witnessed thousands demonstrating in support of the leadership rather than protesting against it, as now. Finally, that "spring" draft proposed implementing the reform on the scale of the unified state of the USSR—reform together, not separately, as it is proposed to carry it out with due regard for the situation which has changed over the summer both in the union and autonomous republics and in the country as a whole.

But, alas, the spring version was unclaimed. They postponed it, wasting time. Then, based on it, back in the summer, there emerged the "500 days" "Shatalin" version and the "presidential" version—the latter, unlike the thoroughly defeated government version, appearing at the finish, so to speak, too late to be subjected to such a fault-finding examination before deputies and the public and so securing advantage. Meanwhile, even the authors themselves speak of its somewhat unfinished nature and, at the same time, its openness to additional work, and the public and the experts are scrutinizing it increasingly closely. And, in scrutinizing it, they note the vagueness of a number of its provisions concerning, for example, the creation of a single all-union market, a reserves system, and an interrepublican economic council. A number of comments on the presidential draft being received by IZVESTIYA dispute such points in the draft as the absolving of enterprises of responsibility for maintaining the social sphere and the revision of the tax legislation adopted not so long ago by the USSR Supreme Soviet—virtually none of the deputies has analyzed these complex questions in either the Russian or the union parliament. And you get the feeling that an in-depth comparative analysis of the programs was sometimes replaced by a choice between more and less popular individuals.

One of the most attractive features of the presidential program compared with the government one in the eyes of the public is, of course, the fact that the first promises to lead to the market without lowering the working people's living standards. But is this realistic? What country has succeeded in such a thing? A section of readers also asks these questions. This attests to people's desire not to warily avoid the market but to arrive at it consciously, with their eyes open, without building another version—this time the market version—of a bright future.

From rapture and high hopes to impatience and suspicion and back again—the pendulum of our public opinion fluctuates between these extremes, which attests to its semi-infantile state of awareness. However, neither of these two extremes can serve as a reliable, long-term basis for profound reforms in the economy. Realism is a more reliable basis. But realism still seems to be an effort in our country. However, it alone can serve as the basis for agreement and harmonious action.

Revenko Answers Questions About Union Treaty

90UN2856A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 20 Sep 90 pp 1, 2

[Report by V. Andriyanov on responses to readers' questions given by G.I. Revenko, member of the USSR Presidential Council; place and date not given: "Indestructible Union?"]

[Text] We recorded up to 100 calls to the editorial office and set aside dozens of letters and telegrams after we had announced the willingness of Grigoriy Ivanovich Revenko, member of the USSR Presidential Council, to answer RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA readers' questions about the new Union treaty and the future of the federation.

"I am 53 years old and work as a radio equipment regulator at the Bryansk Electrical Engineering Plant," A. Golskiy writes. "I have a question for G.I. Revenko: What will happen to the USSR, and how will the country's disintegration be prevented?"

This question was, perhaps, repeated more often than others, so let us begin with it.

[Revenko] You know, two problems are currently being discussed actively in the Presidential Council and in the country: the Union treaty and market relations. They are interrelated, there will not be one without the other. They are being strongly supported by a third problem, a very difficult one—how to establish respect for the law in the country. In my opinion it is better not to enact an edict unless we know how to fulfill it. On account of various deformations, a scornful attitude toward the law has taken shape in our country.

Now about the Union treaty in more detail. Formerly, when the first four republics negotiated the formation of the Union, everything was clear: world revolution, a shining future, away with the darkness of tsarism. And, of course, objective political and economic necessity. Today, I believe, the core of the Union treaty should be the assurance without exception of the rights and liberties of each citizen, in each republic, in each point of the Soviet Union. This is the fulcrum on which the approaches to a future and renewed Union are today being shaped.

There is a collective search for the formula: What is meant by a regenerated Union? The opinion that the future Union will be a Union of sovereign states, in which each of its founders is responsible for the fate of the entire country and all are responsible for each, is

becoming established increasingly. This formula is beginning to be accepted, evidently. Who should draw up the Union treaty? There is agreement that this should be a treaty created by sovereign republics, not one imposed by someone or other. Even if there are initially, let us suppose, 15 drafts of such a treaty, this would signify for us nothing but good and the consideration of all opinions.

The Union treaty is being prepared against the background of strong criticism of the center. And this is understandable. Why? When one begins to analyze what kind of power there is over the Union republics, one sees that this power is not attached, as it were, to the republics. It is as if it has been shaped above them. It is therefore frequently believed that it is possible to demand everything from this power while giving it nothing. Just demand, demand, demand from it. Without going to the trouble of finding arguments, many people here believe that it is their region or republic that is contributing more and receiving less. In today's extremely tense social atmosphere this, unfortunately, often works, by no means contributing to trust and consolidation. Instead of such "reciprocal payments," would it not be more useful to think together about ways out of the economic crisis which has hit all of us?

Many problems emerged on account of the evolved structures of the organs of Union administration. I, for example, believe that we need to switch from the ministry board to a board of ministers of all republics.

A Union treaty will not work as long as there is this vertical pillar of ministries and departments with their present functions. This means that entire system, oppressing, distributing, controlling, receiving. Fear of this system has been manifested particularly in the course of consultations.

It is becoming perfectly obvious that a decisive renunciation of such vertical structures is necessary. The horizontal composition of economic relations. Had we moved more rapidly in this direction, we would today, for example, already be talking about "steel" or "coal" communities, which would themselves be deciding what kind of life they would be leading.

Whoever is keeping a close watch on the economy can see that there has been no progress in managerial matters. The new power structures of various levels are copying, unfortunately, the same system, merely having removed the upper stratum. Earlier everything was governed by the Union ministry, now the republic ministries are successfully shoring up their positions. And there also there is an unfettered people. Some are shouting that they will produce no shortening, others are threatening to shut the valves on the oil pipeline. These are naive notions. The producer and manufacturer will settle accounts with the authorities with taxes. And nothing else.

"How are the negotiations with the republics going?" is a typical question of almost every letter.

[Revenko] First about what is most important. The main thing is an understanding of the need for a radical renewal of the principles of the composition of the Union and its functioning. The majority supports a future Union as a renewed federation and advocates a USSR constitution and the state sovereignty of the Union as a whole. Of course, there are also other viewpoints, and they have been expressed in the course of the consultations. Such important propositions concerning statehood as property and the tax, credit and finance, and currency systems have been analyzed in earnest. Problems of the autonomous entities and citizenship have been broached constantly. Problem-solving groups are now at work. Their goal is together with the republics to remove the contradictions that have been revealed in the course of the consultations. This is lengthy and difficult work.

What authority will the soviets have? Defense, the environment, space, power engineering, and the transport system, and arguments are under way about foreign policy activity. Complications in the formulation of common approaches to the provisions of the Union treaty are arising for the added reason that new laws, which are frequently at variance with and in conflict even with legislative enactments of the Union which have recently been adopted, are being enacted in each republic essentially.

In the course of the consultations, all the declarations adopted in the republics have been analyzed. In the main, aside from the Baltic ones, these declarations are, despite certain differences, in favor of the Union.

"And what about the creation of national armies?" P. Mironov, Krasnodar.

[Revenko] I have to say that even the West has become uneasy in this connection. And this is why. Will nuclear weapons be shared is a very disturbing question.

It is said that we will cede defense questions to the Union and reserve to ourselves a municipal guard. In principle many structures evidently need to be rearranged in tune with more civilized standards. To what extent is it possible to decide its internal questions for each republic?! Why may it not bring order to bear at home itself? Have your own internal forces, if you will, or municipal police and militia, and keep order yourselves.

You will recall how the Congress of People's Deputies was pulled into Fergana in order that the deputies might adopt the decision to strangle some people. Is this dignified in a sovereign republic, an independent state—restoring order on the streets?! There are questions here, but we need to approach them with composure.

One further point—there is no oppressive center at the consultations. We patiently hear one another out. And then tally the results.

Take such an important topic as the credit and monetary system. You will surely have noticed that the representatives of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] have called it a subject of joint jurisdiction with the Union. This was the result of negotiations.

There are currently very many arguments about currency. It is my personal opinion that this will pass when the ruble is convertible.

Some republics brought drafts of their treaties. Others are as yet fixing their sights and conducting consultations between themselves. I consider this a useful process. I believe that we will, nonetheless, have to have an interrepublic market and agreements between the republics. And at the same time, however, there can be no serious talk about market relations without the normal functioning of the all-Union market based on its world understanding and with its own privileges and sanctions. Just imagine what would happen if there were no accord, no mutual understanding. Some people, say, would be unable to conclude an agreement with Uzbekistan on cotton. But with us light industry is scattered throughout the country.

Even in the United States, incidentally, there are commissions for trade between states and relations between them. In my view, in 200 years the United States has formed a very powerful center with important states' rights. As soon as the interests of the United States are affected, all else is thrown aside.

We cannot unequivocally adopt the experience of any country. There is no other such example in the world, except perhaps for Switzerland, with its three peoples. We have 30 times three, and peoples that have taken shape with their own historical territories, what is more.

This is an important point for a Soviet treaty—a guarantee of the integrity of territories. People's equal rights and liberties. The equality of all republics. A guarantee of the security of the citizen and the people and their protection as a whole. And, of course, the comprehensive nature of development....

There is no longer anywhere else in the world with such a degree of integration of the national economy as with us. The structure is such that one enterprise could bring the whole country to its knees. We have already encountered this. Stepanakert failed to supply elevators and virtually paralyzed all housing construction.

Now about the international aspect. Just think about it yourself. The authority of the Soviet Union in the world is enormous. Many of our country's positions have become the basis of the modern world arrangement. We subscribe to no less than 100 fundamental international enactments. If they were to be disrupted, it would be necessary to embark on virtually a new world arrangement. With regard for these factors an understanding of the need for a stabilization of the situation in the Union is strengthening overseas. This is in the common interest and, of course, primarily in ours.

Account must also be taken of the following point. Aside from geopolitical interests and the common interests of the republics, there is the interest of the individual, the family.

Just think: 60 million people live outside of their territorial formations. Plus a tremendous number of mixed marriages—the census has not yet provided a precise figure.

But when the division owing to extremism and nationalism runs through families, when people begin to ascertain what kind of blood they have—Russian, Ukrainian, Kazakh, Jewish—this is catastrophic. So from this viewpoint—humanitarian—also, the Union is essential.

And one further issue. Let us think a little about the actions of the republic parliaments. It is good thing, say, that the Ukraine has declared its responsibility for the millions of Ukrainians scattered around the world. It is very important that the republics' new declarations contain such responsibility for the fate of their peoples, not only indigenous. I am sure that a renewed Union also will be a strong guarantor of the free and equal development of the country's peoples.

It is also necessary to arrive at the sound concordance of the interests of all republics. And it needs to be clearly understood here that the fewer powers delegated to the Union, the less the participation in Union affairs. No one, evidently, would agree with the following procedure: Give a particle, but take from the Union as much as you want. Do you remember how a foreign newspaper portrayed their policy to our Baltic republics? The cow's head was in Russia, the udders in Lithuania. And some people would like to preserve such a position as long as possible: We will milk as much as possible and go our own way. But this is a dishonest policy.

Opinions to the effect that the new Union should have the right not only to admit new members but also to apply sanctions against those who violate the treaty, up to and including deprivation of the right to be a part of the Union, have also been expressed.

Of course, considerably more questions and contradictions will arise. They will have to be removed in the course of the work of joint groups and delegations, and ways of forming a voluntary, equal Union in which the dignity of each is reliably protected will have to be found. I believe that the new Union treaty should be a document of national accord, candid and honest. It should contain nothing dogmatic.

Concerning supremacy of the law. There are very many approaches: ratifying Union laws, not ratifying them, removing some things or not accepting them in full. If some people dispute some article or other and there are sufficient grounds for this, the treaty will contain a reference to the effect that it is adopted without this article. It may be assumed that some republics will try to

assemble as many items as possible within their independent jurisdiction. But I am convinced that time will make its own prudent adjustments.

Foreign Ministry specialists, for example, estimated that even a small five-man embassy would be expensive. A tremendous sum would be needed for this, it turns out. And as for a dozen embassies for a small republic? The republics did some counting and decided to have representations only where there is a large diaspora.

A treaty that is ideal in all respects cannot be achieved at once, evidently. Reality is richer and more diverse, and the treaty should not be frozen but open.

It would be more rational, say—I return to this matter once again—to form not a ministry board but a council or board of the republics' foreign ministers. Of course, it will be necessary to get together and formulate policy because it cannot be like it has been until now. The new processes have to be seen and understood face on. After all, it is necessary today to settle difficult conflicts not overseas but in the republics.

In sum: The Union treaty is taking shape in a quite contradictory manner. We are now faced with the next stage.

At the last meeting of the Council of the Federation we reached general accord on the need for the formation on a parity basis of a preparatory committee for the elaboration of a new Union treaty made up of authorized delegations of the republics headed by their top state officials with the direct participation of the president, chairman of the Council of Ministers, and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. This means that the work on a Union treaty is moving toward a new, higher level.

We have to prepare the draft wording of a future Union treaty for discussion in all the republics.

"Will the Union treaty be submitted for public discussion, and when and how?" D. Ismailov, Baku.

[Revenko] There are several viewpoints. One is ratification by the Supreme Soviets. Another is public discussion. A third is referendums. I believe that an agreed draft treaty will nonetheless be published. Everyone will be able to have his say. Including about the form of approval. Nothing will be imposed. There are proposals even now that the act of signing and practical introduction of the Union treaty be a major ceremonial event.

"Might 30 December—the day the Soviet Union was formed—be chosen for this?" A. Krupennikov, Kuybyshev.

[Revenko] We have had such proposals. Specifically, it is advised that a congress of the peoples, as it were, be convened. There are various proposals. Everyone agrees that this day should subsequently be the country's main holiday.

"Have you turned to the 1922 documents? It seems to me that there is much there that is instructive." N. Krushanov, Khabarovsk.

[Revenko] We are doing so. The continuity of the Union is being stressed by many republics. There is, indeed, much that is instructive there. The Union is now being criticized here precisely largely on account of the fact that part two of the 1922 treaty, namely the mechanism of administration of the Union, has not been properly fulfilled.

"We are continuously lagging behind—in economics, in politics.... Why such manifest procrastination?" N. Meshcheryakov, Saratov Oblast.

[Revenko] Yes, we are indeed greatly behind. However, as far as the Union treaty is concerned, let us think about the recent past. Was there really an opportunity for adopting it a year or so ago?

I would not answer in the negative. A treaty could have been adopted. But the question arises: What kind? The time that has elapsed has influenced our understanding of the Union appreciably. We shall not hide the fact that the organs of power of that time bore the tremendous burden of the past. A treaty signed at that time would most likely have been under the fire of criticism of the newly formed soviets. So I do not consider the time that has elapsed a missed opportunity. It has been a period of comprehension of the new positions. I would like to add to this one thing. Account has to be taken of the country's history and the cohesion of the peoples that live on these expanses. And history testifies that unification has occurred not only by force but in accordance with the will of the peoples also. I shall not list historical documents: Everyone who is interested in this subject may easily acquaint himself with them.

"There are in our mailbag, Grigoriy Ivanovich, many questions concerning the Presidential Council...."

[Revenko] It is a new structure, and, as everyone knows, it is today too soon, of course, to say how it should operate. Experience is being gained, slowly or quickly is for you to judge, but it seems to me that the amount of work being done there is more than could even have been imagined earlier. All that was in the government, the Politburo, the Central Committee, in all other structures has now streamed into the Presidential Council. However, a member of the Presidential Council does not make decisions. The decisions are made by the president. We, on the other hand, are obliged to propose the best option to the president on the basis of an analysis of a vast amount of material.

I would like to say that there is a democratic atmosphere in the council and that everyone is free to defend his position and does defend it thoroughly. What are the difficulties? We need to quickly intellectualize the Presidential Council and rally around it a kind of brains consortium, and not of just one level of thinking, what is more.

The Presidential Council does not have the right to see only one or two colors. This is a matter of principle. I defend precisely this position for we need, after all, to see the entire range of colors, the whole country, and the new movements that are coming into being, and to take account of their influence on the social and political situation. I will be candid: It makes a great deal of sense to me to have many different people, extreme persons, the left, the right, perhaps, conservatives, innovators, working on the Union treaty, and I see a unifying purpose in this.

It is only, if you wish, as the result of a clash of different viewpoints and the consideration of many opinions and positions that we will be able to arrive at a treaty uniting, not disuniting, the peoples.

Here is a surprise question: "Members of the Presidential Council are appointed by the president. To keep one's seat, consequently, is it necessary to get along with the president?" V. Krayukhin, Pavlodar.

[Revenko] I have come to the conclusion that the president gets most from those who do not make up to him, those whose position is evident. It is more honest, whomsoever it concern, when one tells it like it is.

I believe that things in the country will not succeed unless we begin in breadth and in depth to rapidly develop horizontal relations and put the interests of the individual at the center of economic life. This will not be to everyone's liking, of course, and will tear away some structures, but we cannot remain silent about this. We cannot adapt to the interests of the particular while ignoring general interests. It could be that speaking about this tomorrow will be too late.

And I feel the same currently as everyone else, I have many doubts and anxieties in my heart. There is a sense that we have lost optimism, civic optimism. There have been difficult times, but we never lost optimism and we emerged from them not weakened but strengthened. I believe it will be this way in the future also.

Kindness is being lost in some way. We have today sunk to the level of a very low civilization. Disrespectfulness and irritation are being increasingly manifested, and the lofty values common to all mankind such as decency, honesty, and industriousness are somehow being pushed into the background and being replaced by narrow-minded pragmatism, deception, and a disrespectful attitude toward the elderly and, particularly, women.

This is a separate subject, perhaps, but I have to mention it. I see society's attitude toward the teacher as one of the reasons. We need to enhance the role of the teacher and restore him to the pedestal of public respect. You know what the deal made with the conscience begins with—with an unearned "three." The schoolboy understands that he can get by without working.

"How do you view our society's attitude toward the Army?" G. Chernykh, Andizhan Oblast.

[Revenko] I believe that an unattractive attitude toward the Army is currently taking shape in society. And we are already garnering the fruits of this attitude. We need to face up to the Army's real difficulties. After all, it is no secret that Army life is like it was in wartime. Take those interethnic conflicts and construction battalions. Yes, how much they could have done had we turned them to the needs of the Army itself.

My vision is such: Wherever the officer goes, his family and he himself should be fixed up better than others even. But today? In my electoral district it is not the peasants who are seething, it is the Army. I know this. It is rightly worried by the lack of social protection. And we need to display concern in earnest for all that concerns the material, social, and pension support of the Army and comply in full with all that is stipulated in the USSR president's edict on measures of social and legal protection for servicemen.

Together with the structure of presidential authority, we need to perfect other structures also. Unwieldy structures have now taken shape in the country: the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet, and all is being repeated locally. Everyone will have noticed, evidently, that the Supreme Soviet discusses some problems, and debate gets underway, and then at the congress the very same, the same persons, the same expressions. What is this? We have nothing else to do? I therefore advocate an efficiently operating Supreme Soviet, and under these conditions the need for the congress will disappear.

All that was earlier united in a decree of the CPSU Central Committee and the Council of Ministers now sails across to the Supreme Soviet. I am afraid that this could become the norm for the Presidential Council also. I even support a particular language for documents of the Presidential Council. In order that there be none of the following words there: call attention to, enhance, improve. All this, evidently, sails across together with the old apparatus: the apparatus sets sail, and all these expressions follow it.

"In my opinion, you in Moscow, in the Presidential Council, the CPSU, and the Council of Ministers are underestimating the danger of nationalism. This force could ultimately sweep away Soviet power also, as has already happened here essentially in the western oblasts of the Ukraine. I would be pleased to hear G.I. Revenko's opinion." D. Kutsenko.

[Revenko] I cannot agree that we are underestimating the danger of nationalism. If there is a force which could destroy the Union, it is only nationalist currents. Truly, the country has encountered fierce nationalism, and not just in one place. There are now many nationalist manifestations, in extreme forms at times. The danger is serious and has spread almost everywhere, and this is particularly disturbing.

This same question is repeated in other letters and memos. Specifically, A. Sigach from Tashkent and V.

Mikhaylova from Belgorod. M. Belozerskaya from the Dnepropetrovskoye community writes: "In the new school year there will be no Russian first grades in our community—only Ukrainian. Is this right? What is the point of all our talk about the great Russian language as the language of interethnic communication?"

[Revenko] This, in my opinion, is a manifest distortion. I believe that the leadership of Dnepropetrovsk Oblast, to which I advise that you send this letter, will look into it. No one needs such bureaucratic rule. Nor will it pass. Writing an order is one thing, but coming to an arrangement with the parents is another.

One further typical question from the mailbag: concerning privileges for members of the Presidential Council.

[Revenko] We have been given good apartments. Members of the Presidential Council have given up luxury automobiles. The Volga has remained, which caused a bit of a shock in other circles. There are no special stores. I finish work late, frequently at 2200 or 2300.

Let us conclude with the same letter with which we began this publication—from the Bryansk worker A. Golskiy.

"I very much hope that your 'direct line' will be permanent. I would like to get answers to questions about the economy, international politics, the environment, and conversion."

The editorial office accepts this proposal.

(Footnote) (The fee for this publication is going to the Defense Against Unemployment Fund.)

Solzhenitsyn Publishes Essay in Moscow Weekly

90UN2835A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 38, 18 Sep 90 pp 3-6

[Article by A.I. Solzhenitsyn published under the rubric "Special Edition. Our Publication": "How Are We To Structure Russia?—A Modest Contribution"]

[Text] **The Immediate Future**

The clock of communism has struck its last hour.

But the concrete structure has not yet collapsed.

Instead of being liberated, we might be squashed under its rubble.

We Are on Our Last Legs

Who of us is not aware at the present time of our problems, even though they are concealed by false statistics? Dragged along for 70 years by the Marxist-Leninist utopia, which was born blind and malignant, we have sacrificed one-third of our population on the executioner's block or dumped it overboard from the "Patriotic" War, which was fought without talent, and even in a self-exterminating way. We have been deprived of our former abundance, we have destroyed the peasant class and its villages, we have made growing grain utterly pointless, we have made the land unaccustomed to producing harvest, and to top it all off we have blanketed the land with seas of marshes. We have befouled the environs of cities with the waste from our primitive industry, we have poisoned rivers, lakes, and fish, and now we are finally destroying the last water, air, and land by adding nuclear death and also by buying extra radioactive wastes from the West for storage. Ruining ourselves for the sake of future conquests, under insane leadership, we have felled our rich forests and plundered our incomparable mineral wealth, the irreplaceable asset of our great grandsons, and mercilessly sold them abroad. We have worn out our women with back-breaking, impossible work, we have taken them away from their children, and left the children themselves to ilinesses, barbarity, and ersatz education. We have completely neglected health care, and we have no medicines. We have even forgotten what healthy food is, millions are homeless, and utter lack of individual rights has permeated the depths of our country. Meanwhile we are clinging to just one thing: Please let us keep on getting as drunk as we possibly can.

But man is constituted in such a way that we can bear all this nonsense and peril even throughout our entire lives as long as nobody tries to wrong or tamper with the **nation**! As long as we have this, nothing can keep us in eternal stupefaction; in our anger-generated courage we can grab stones, sticks, lances, and guns and pounce on our neighbors so we can set their houses on fire and slay them. This is how man is constituted: Nothing will convince us that our famine, poverty, premature deaths, the degeneration of children—that any of these troubles are of greater importance than our national pride!

This is why, in our endeavor to propose some steps toward our convalescence and recovery, we are forced to begin by answering this question: What will come of the nations? Within what geographical framework will we get better or die?—rather than begin with festering sores and debilitating suffering. Only later will we talk about a cure.

What Is Russia?

This notion of "Russia" is already tattered and torn; everyone uses this notion, whether appropriately or not. When the monstrous USSR went to grab slices of Asia or Africa, the entire world also repeated: "Russia, the Russians..."

What exactly is Russia? Today, and tomorrow (even more importantly). **Who** sees himself as a part of the future Russia? **Where** do the Russians themselves envisage the borders of Russia?

After three quarters of a century, "the socialist friendship of peoples" being drummed into us and trumpeted aloud, the communist power has so neglected, entangled, and sullied relations among these peoples that we can no longer see our way back to the peaceful coexistence of

nations, with lamentable exceptions, to the even somnolent indistinguishability of nations which was almost achieved in the last decades of prerevolutionary Russia. Perhaps it is not too late to figure this out and settle it—but without the terrible troubles that are now enveloping us like a hurricane. What we see today is that for the future it will be more peaceful and open for those who need to separate and live apart to go ahead and do so—actually because of this universal national trouble, which eclipses the everything else in our lives; may they disappear, the causes of this suffering from whose effects only a few in our country are escaping at the present time.

Alas, many of us are aware that at times one does not want to live if it has to be in a communal apartment. This is how desperate the situation with the nations is in our country.

In many republics on the periphery, centrifugal forces have built up to such a degree that they will not be stopped without violence and bloodshed—nor **should** they be stopped at that price! No matter how we turn it all now—still the "Soviet Socialist" will fall apart, **still!**—and we do not have a real choice, and there is nothing to reflect on, all we can do is move more quickly to anticipate troubles so that the splits can occur without unnecessary human suffering, and then only the ones that really cannot be avoided.

This is how I see it: We should immediately proclaim loudly and clearly: The three Baltic republics, the three Transcaucasian republics, the four Central Asian republics, and also Moldavia, if it is drawn more to Romania, these 11—indeed!—*definitely must be separated for good.* (More about the process of separation several pages below.)

About Kazakhstan. Its present tremendous territory has been patched together by communists without rhyme or reason: If nomadic herds crossed certain areas once a year, they were in Kazakhstan. After all, during these years it was believed that where the boundaries were drawn was not at all important—just a little bit later, it could happen any time, all the nations would merge into a single one. The perspicacious Ilich I referred to the issue of borders as "even the tenth order of priority." (This is how Karabakh was appended to Azerbaijan, what difference does it make where it goes, at the time it was important to curry favor with the good friend of the Soviets, Turkey.) Until 1936, Kazakhstan was still considered an autonomous republic of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], and later it was promoted to a Union republic. Meanwhile, Kazakhstan was carved out of southern Siberia and the southern Urals, plus the desert central expanses which have since been transformed and built up by Russians, prisoners, and the exiled peoples. Even today Kazakhs account for appreciably less than one-half in this entire inflated Kazakhstan. Joined together, their stable native parts comprise a large southern arc of oblasts, running from the extreme east to the west, almost to the Caspian Sea, and are indeed populated mainly by Kazakhs. If they want to separate within these confines—God be with them.

The only thing that will remain after the subtraction of these 12 is what we may call **Rus**, as it has been called for ages (the word "Russian" has for centuries included Minor Russians, Great Russians, and Belorussians), or Russia (the name since the 18th century) or, according to the currently correct meaning, the Union of Russia.

Nonetheless 100 peoples and ethnic groups will remain within it, from those that are not small at all to those that are really small. From this point, from this threshold, all of us must exhibit great wisdom and kindness; but from this moment on we may and should be at great pains to be reasonable and cordial in affirming the fruitful commonwealth of nations, the integrity of the culture, and the preservation of the language within each nation.

A Word to the Great Russians

As early as the beginning of the century our prominent statesman-intellectual S.Ye. Kryzhanovskiy predicted: "The native Russia does not have sufficient resources of cultural and moral forces to assimilate the entire periphery. This is sapping the strength of the national Russian nucleus."

And this was said in a rich, prosperous country, before the extermination of our people by the millions, and not the blind, indiscriminate extermination of all of them but the deliberate killing off of the *cream* of the Russian people.

By now this makes all kinds sense: **We do not have the energy** to deal with the periphery, either economic or spiritual. **We do not have the energy** to run an Empire!—And we do not need it, let us shrug it off: It is crushing us, it is draining us, and it is accelerating our demise.

I am alarmed to see that the awakening Russian national self-awareness in many of its parts cannot free itself from the expansionist-great power thinking and imperial befuddlement, and has borrowed from the communists the inflated "Soviet patriotism" which has never existed; and it takes pride in "the great Soviet power" which in the age of the knucklehead Ilich II merely sapped the last productivity of our decades and spent it on arms which nobody needs (and which, unused, are now being destroyed)—this has put us to shame, and exposed us to the entire planet as a cruel, greedy, immoderate aggressor—at a time when our knees are already trembling and we are on the verge of losing all our power. This is the most pernicious distortion of our consciousness: "But we are a large country, and we are taken seriously everywhere"—already in the time of our death throes this means whole-hearted support for communism. After all, Japan was capable of reconciling, giving up both its international mission and its lucrative political ventures—and it prospered immediately.

A strict **choice** must now be made: between the Empire, which is destroying us above all, and the spiritual and corporeal salvation of our people. We all know that our mortality rate is increasing, exceeding our birth rate—if this continues we will disappear from the face of the Earth! Holding on to the great Empire means killing off our own people. Why do we need this variegated patchwork?—so that the Russians will lose their unique character? We should strive for a pure spirit in what is left of the Great Power rather than for an expansive Power. Through the separation of the 12 republics, through this apparent sacrifice, Russia will, on the contrary, free itself for its precious *internal* development and will finally devote its attention and care to its own. Besides, what hope is there for the preservation and development of the Russian culture, given the current mixture? There is still less and less hope. Everything will be mixed together and ground up.

Unfortunately, our resilient and worthy Russian emigre community has also sustained this myth of "oneness and indivisibility" throughout 70 years of poverty and travail. After all, for a "one-and-indivisible" man of 1914 vintage, Poland is also "ours" (it was an extravagant whim of Alexander I to "make her happy" with his patronage), and there is no way "to give it back." But who would step forward to insist on it now? Did Russia really become poorer because of the separation of Poland and Finland? All it did was straighten out. In this manner we will straighten out still more after shedding the heavy burden of "the Central Asian underbelly," an equally ill-considered conquest of Alexander II—he would have done better to apply these energies to the unfinished building of his reforms, to the birth of a truly popular zemstvo [elective district council in pre-revolutionary Russia].

Our 20th century philosopher, Ivan. A. Ilin, wrote that the spiritual life of a people is more important than the extent of its territory or even of its economic wealth; the strength and welfare of the people are incomparably dearer than all external, prestigious goals.

Besides, the periphery is **already** actually falling away. Really, we must not wait for the disorderly multitudes of our refugees to start streaming away from there.

We must stop parroting: "We are proud to be Russians," "We are proud of our boundless motherland," "We are proud..." We must understand that **after** experiencing everything in which we took justifiable pride, our people gave in to the catastrophe of the Year 1917 (in broader terms: 1915 through 1932) and since then we have been pathetically different from what we used to be and we can no longer be carried away by our plans: How should we restore the mighty state and external greatness of the former Russia. Our fathers and grandfathers have already *made the choice* for us, for one century at this point and, perhaps, for two centuries, when during a deadly war they "drove their bayonets into the ground" and deserted in order to plunder their neighbors at home. Nor should we take pride in the Soviet-German war during which we sacrificed in excess of 30 million, 10 times more than the enemy did, only to reinforce the tyranny over ourselves. We must not "take pride" and reach out to take the lives of others. But rather we must perceive that our people are in the throes of an exhausting illness and pray that God will grant us healing and, to this end, wisdom in our actions.

If it is true that over these decades Russia has given its life blood to the republics, we shall not suffer economic losses from it either; all it will lead to is conservation of our physical strength.

A Word to the Ukrainians and Belorussians

I am almost one-half Ukrainian myself, and in my early years I grew up surrounded by the sounds of Ukrainian speech. I spent the greater part of my years at the front in sorrowful Belorussia, and I have come to painfully love her sad meagerness and her gentle people.

I address both of these peoples not as an outsider but as *one of their own.*

Besides, our people split into three branches only because of the menacing misfortune of the Mongolian invasion and Polish colonization. All this talk of a separate Ukrainian people with a separate non-Russian language existing almost from the ninth century on is a recently invented falsehood. All of us together have roots in precious Kiev "from whence the Russian land came to be," according to Nestor's Chronicles, and from whence Christianity came to shine on us. The same princes ruled us: Yaroslav the Wise divided Kiev, Novgorod, and the entire expanse from Chernigov to Ryazan, Murom, and Beloozero among his sons; Vladimir Monomakh was at the same time the prince of both Kiev and Rostov-Suzdal; there was the same unity in the service of metropolitans. The people of Kievan Rus were the ones who created the State of Moscow. In Lithuania and Poland, the Belorussians and Minor Russians perceived themselves as Russians and fought Polonization and conversion to Catholicism. The return of these lands to Russia was perceived by all at the time as *Unification.*

Indeed, it is painful and shameful to recall the ukases of the time of Alexander II (1863, 1876) on banning the Ukrainian language in journalism, and subsequently in literature as well. However, this did not remain in effect for long, and this was one of the insane ossifications in both the government and church policy which prepared the way for the demise of the Russian state system.

However, the vain socialist Rada of 1917 was put together by an agreement of politicians rather than by popular vote. When it proclaimed the secession of the Ukraine from Russia, abandoning the federation, it did not poll public opinion.

I have already had occasion to respond to emigre Ukrainian nationalists who drum it into America that "communism is a myth, it is the Russians rather than the communists who want to conquer the entire world"

(here it is—"the Russians" have already seized China and Tibet, this is how it has been written for 30 years now in a law passed by the American Senate). Communism is such a *myth*, which both the Russian and the Ukrainians have experienced firsthand in the dungeons of the Cheka [Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counterrevolution and Sabotage] from 1918 on. This is a *myth* which swept out even the seed grain in the Volga area and sacrificed 29 Russian provinces to the drought and death-dealing famine of 1921-1922. And the same *myth* treacherously thrust the Ukraine into the equally merciless famine of 1932-1933. Having been forced into collectivization together with whips and guns, are we really not bound together by this bloody suffering?

As late as 1848 the Galicians in Austria still called their national council "Chief Russian Council." But then a distorted, nonpopular, Ukrainian language, littered with German and Polish words, grew up in the severed Galicia at the instigation of Austria, along with the temptation to wean the Carpathian Russians away from Russian speech, and the lure of complete, all-Ukrainian separatism which wells up among the leaders of the current emigre community either out of idyllic ignorance about the notion that St. Vladimir "was Ukrainian," or because of insane frenzy: "May communism live, may Muscovites perish!" [previous six words in Ukrainian]

How could we fail to share the pain caused by the deadly torment of the Ukraine during Soviet times. But from where does this scheme to cut off the Ukraine across living flesh (including areas where the old Ukraine has never been, such as the "wild field" of the nomads—Novorossiya, or the Crimea, the Donbass, and almost to the Caspian Sea) come. If there is to be "the self-determination of a nation," the nation should determine **its own** future. This will not be resolved without a popular vote.

At present, separating the Ukraine means cutting through millions of families and people; look at the mix of the population; there are entire oblasts with a preponderance of Russians. Look at the number of people who have difficulty choosing between the two nationalities; look at the number of people of mixed origins; look at the number of mixed marriages—after all, nobody has considered them "mixed" so far. There is not a hint of intolerance between the Ukrainians and the Russians in the bulk of the basic population.

Brothers! We do not need this cruel division!—this is the insanity of the communist years. We have suffered together through the Soviet times, together we have ended up in this pit, and together we shall climb out of it.

There has been a multitude of outstanding names at the intersection of our two cultures for two centuries. As M.P. Dragomanov put it, "inseparable, but they will not mix either."

The path should be open to the Ukrainian and Belorussian culture through friendship and joy, not only on the territories of the Ukraine and Belorussia but also in Great Russia. There should be no forced Russification (but no forced Ukrainization either, as was the case after the late 1920's), there should be totally unrestricted development of parallel cultures, and instruction in schools should be in both languages at the option of the parents.

Of course, if the Ukrainian people *indeed wished* to separate, nobody would dare keep them by force. However this expansiveness is varied, and only the *local* populace may decide the future of its area, of its oblast. In the course of this, any newly formed ethnic minority in this area should likewise encounter the same noncoercive attitude toward itself.

Everything said above applies fully to Belorussia, except that over there unquestioning separatism has not been instigated.

One more thing: We must acknowledge the troubles at Chernobyl inflicted on Belorussia and the Ukraine by the careerists and fools of the Soviet system, and make all possible restitution for them.

A Word to the Small Peoples and Nationalities

Our state will still, inevitably, remain a multinational one, even after all the separations, though we are not eager for this.

For some nations, even large ones such as Tatar, Bashkir, Udmurt, Komi, Chuvash, Mordovians, Mary, and Yakut, there is almost no choice: It is impractical for a state to exist when it is entirely surrounded by another state. Other national areas will have an external border, and if they want to separate there must be no ban on it either. (On top of this, the indigenous nationality is not the majority in some autonomous republics.) However, it makes sense for them to stay in the Union as well, given the preservation of their entire national uniqueness in culture, religion, and economics.

As the creation of many small state entities in the 20th century has shown, this places on them an excessive burden of too many offices, representative bodies, and armies, and cuts them off from spacious territories for building up trade and public life. In this manner the mountain peoples of the Caucasus, who were distinguished by their deep loyalty to the Russian throne before the revolution, will probably still think about whether it makes sense for them to separate. It is not the large Union of Russia that needs the small peoples of the periphery to cling to it; the latter need this more. And if they want to be with us, may their wish be granted.

The superficial and false Soviet state system nonetheless has elements which are correct if they are executed honestly. This is what the Soviet of Nationalities is, a chamber where the voice of even the smallest nationality should be heard and not lost. At the same time, the current hierarchy of "Union republics"—autonomous republics—autonomous oblasts—and national okrugs—is fair. The numerical strength of a people should not be

overlooked; relinquishing these ratios leads to chaos. The United Nations can stagnate in this way, but not a living state.

Of course, the path should be open for the complete return of the Crimean Tatars to the Crimea. However, given the 21st century population density, the Crimea can hold eight to 10 million people, and the 100,000-strong Tatar people cannot claim for itself the right to *own* the Crimea.

Finally, there are the smallest nationalities: the Nenets, the Permyak, the Evenki, the Mansi, the Khakass, the Chukchi, and the Koryak.... And all of the smallest cannot be enumerated. They all lived well in the tsarist "prison of the peoples," and we, the communist Soviet Union, dragged them into extinction. Our accursed administration and our rapacious and mindless industry have wronged them grievously, bringing peril and poison to their land and destroying the last foundation for the life of these nationalities, especially those whose size is so menacingly small that it does not make it possible for them to fight for survival. We must move fast—reinforce, revitalize, and save them! It is not yet too late.

Every people, even the smallest, is a unique facet of God's design. Paraphrasing a Christian commandment, Vladimir Solovyev wrote: "Love all other peoples as you love your own."

The 20th century is shaken and corrupted by politics that are divorced from all morality. Statesmen are exempt from what is required of any person of integrity. We have reached the final hour for looking for more elevated forms of statehood based not only on egoism but also on compassion.

The Process of Separation

Therefore, we must *proclaim* immediately and firmly the indisputable right of the 12 republics in question to separate completely. What if some of them hesitate about separation? Equally indisputably, we, those who remain, will be forced to proclaim *our* separation from them. This is too long overdue, it is irrevocable, and it will blow up here and there. By now everyone can see that we are not going to live together. Therefore let us not drag out this mutual burden.

On top of this, this tortuous and costly process of separation will make the first transition period, the first time of new development, more burdensome for all of us: A great deal of money will still be needed, money which is not available to begin with. But only this separation will clear up the future outlook for us.

However the real separation itself cannot be accomplished by any quick declaration. All abrupt unilateral actions mean injuring a multitude of human destinies, and the mutual disintegration of economies. This should not look like the flight of the Portuguese from Angola when it was relegated to disorder and many years of civil war. From this moment on, commissions of experts from all sides should sit down to work. Let us not forget either how irresponsibly negligent the Soviet marking of boundaries was. In certain places specifically revised boundaries might be needed in keeping with the actual settlement, and in some places local referendums under impartial control will be needed.

Of course, all of this sorting out could take several years.

Millions of people are faced with a difficult question: Should they stay where they are or leave? This entails destroying their entire lives and day-to-day existence, and a need for considerable assistance. (This is not only for the Russians from the periphery but also for the natives of the periphery living in Russia.) Where are they to go? Where is their new shelter? How are they to get by until they get a new job? This should not be their personal trouble but the concern of all of these expert commissions and of state compensation. Every newly created state should provide clear-cut guarantees of minority rights.

An even more complex issue: How will they arrange the painless division of the national economies or the establishment of trade exchanges and industrial cooperation on an independent basis.

Only in the course of this work, and even after its completion, will real issues arise for every state entity, rather than the accursed "nationality issue," which has now gotten under our skin to the point of distorting all feelings and all reality.

Strikingly unexpected occurrences come to us from this future even now. Georgia is impatiently waiting for national independence! (Incidentally, Russia did not conquer it by force, but Lenin did in 1921.) But even now we have persecution of the Abkhazians, persecution of the Ossetians, and the Meskhs exiled by Stalin to their native land are banned from returning—is this what the fervently desired national freedom is all about?

Whatever we undertake, whatever we contemplate in our current political life, not one of us should expect any good for as long as our cruel will pursues only our own *interests*, overlooking not only God's justice but even the most modest morality.

Urgent Measures for the Union of Russia

Over three quarters of a century we have grown so poor and nasty, we have become so desperate, that many people are giving up, and it already seems that only the intercession of Providence can save us.

But God helps those who help themselves.

The fate of our children, our will to live, 1,000 years of our past, and the spirit of our ancestors which has somehow come down to us, will help us find the strength to overcome this, all of this.

We must not lose our presence of mind and circumspect wisdom in the selection of our first measures, even

though we have not been allotted the time to reflect on better paths of development and to compile a properly paced program, we are doomed to quiver, toss and turn, and patch up the leaks, and we are constrained by our primary needs, each of which cries out to be satisfied.

I would not take it upon myself to single-handedly enumerate them: The best practical minds should come together and consult, and the best energies should be devoted to cooperation. Everything is weeping in our present-day economy, and we must find the path for it to take. There is no life without it. It is necessary to develop the people's sense of labor, and this has to be done as soon as possible because for a half century no one has found any reward in work. There is no one to grow wheat for bread, no one to take care of the cattle. Millions are living in environments that cannot be called dwellings, and spend decades in filthy dormitories. The elderly and invalids are as poor as beggars. Our once magnificent expanses are dirtied by industrial trash heaps and torn up because of the monstrous lack of roads. Nature, ungratefully despised by us, is taking revenge, and the radioactive stains of Chernobyl, and not only Chernobyl, are spreading out.

And now on top of that, do we have to prepare for the resettlement of our fellow citizens who are losing their residences? Indeed, it is inevitable.

And—where are we to get the money?

How long will we continue to supply and reinforce the tyrannical regimes we have planted in various parts of the earth, which are incapable of survival, those insatiable embezzlers of our wealth: Cuba, Vietnam, Ethiopia, Angola, North Korea? After all, we are interested in everything, and we have not mentioned all of the countries yet. Thousands of our advisers are still loafing around wherever they end up. How much blood was shed in Afghanistan—would it not be a pity let go of it, too? So, fork over the money for this one, too?... All of this means tens of billions per year.

He who will revoke *this* with a single stroke and instantaneously will be a statesman and a patriot.

How long and for what reason will we keep cranking out more and more new types of offensive weapons? For an all-oceanic Navy? For capturing the planet? All of this means hundreds of billions a year, and this should also be cut off instantaneously. Space can wait also.

On top of that there is the preferential supply of our raw materials, which are still good for everything, to Eastern Europe. They have lived in "the socialist camp," and they have had enough. We are happy for the countries of Eastern Europe, let them live and prosper at will, but let them pay for everything at world prices.

So, this is not enough? Then put an end to rash capital investments in industry which do not come to fruition.

Finally, there are the immense assets of the CPSU; everybody is already talking about this. They looted much of the people's wealth and used it for 70 years. Of course, they will never return all that has been wasted, thrown about, and stolen. But at least give back what remains: buildings and sanatoriums, special farms, and publishing houses. And live on your membership dues. (And for tenure strictly in the party, pay for retirement benefits with your own money rather than with money from the state.)

All this nomenklatura bureaucracy, the parasitic government apparatus comprising many millions, paralyzing all public life with their high salaries, perquisites, and special shops—we must stop feeding them! They must engage in useful labor, and they must get what they earn. Under the new order, four-fifths of all ministries and committees will also become unnecessary.

Money will come from all of these sources.

What have five or six years of much-touted "perestroyka" brought us? Pathetic reshuffling in the Central Committee. Slapping together an ugly, artificial electoral system with a view solely to the Communist Party's clinging to power. Slipshod, confused, and indecisive laws.

No path will be open to the people, even to the most urgent issues, and we will not achieve anything sensible until the Communist Party goes beyond merely relinquishing the constitutional provision and completely gives up all influence on economic and state life, completely abandons governing us, any sphere of our lives or any locality. It would be desirable for the party to do this through public atonement rather than for it to be pushed and shoved out by force—atoning for leading the country into an impasse through a string of crimes, cruelty, and absurdities, and for not knowing a way out. This is what is in order now, rather than building up a new Russian Communist Party with a view to disgraceful continuity, inheriting all the blood and dirt in the name of Russia, and moving against the course of history. Such a public admission by the party of its guilt, criminality, and helplessness will for the first time at least clear the air of our densely oppressive moral atmosphere.

Towering high above us is the granite monolith of the KGB, blocking our access to the future. Their ruses implying that they are particularly needed at exactly this time for international intelligence are easy to see through. Everybody can see that it is exactly the other way around. Their entire purpose is to exist for their own sake and suppress any movement among the people. There is no longer any justification for this Cheka-KGB with its 70 years of bloody and malevolent history, nor does it have the right to exist.

The Land

There is a reason why the land was given the miraculous and blessed property of bearing fruit. The groups of people who are incapable of using this property of the land will perish.

For man, the land is significant not only economically but also morally. Gleb Uspenskiy and Dostoyevskiy—and they are not the only ones—have convincingly written about this in our country.

The weakening of the attraction to the land poses a great danger for the national psyche. At present the peasant sensibility is so downtrodden and eradicated among our people that it may not be possible to revive it. It is late, much too late.

The way leasing is now being introduced smacks of deception and mockery, there is no rhyme or reason to it, and it will merely undermine the willingness of the people who are reaching out to the land. The lessees remain oppressively dependent on the kolkhoz-sovkhoz [state farm and collective farm] authorities, and the latter may engage in lawlessness to their hearts' content. Frequently, the worst, abandoned lands are allocated for leasing; more is charged for them, and the implements are also sold at inflated prices. Meanwhile, the lessees are forced to sell their products at lower prices. They fail to give to the lessees the feed promised to them, or else they take away the animals given to them for fattening; both labor and money are lost. The "Republic Association for the Sale of Agricultural Equipment" may suddenly violate a contract. Besides, a parcel of land does not yet mean freedom for a peasant. He also needs a free market, available transportation, loans, equipment repair, and construction materials.

We embark on all reforms in the worst way possible. And this is also the case here. They are merely harming the cause and robbing the people of the remnants of their belief in the promises of the authorities.

In general, personal leasing (from local self-government bodies rather than kolkhozes) is undoubtedly a step toward improving our agriculture as compared to kolkhozes. Leasing should be for life, and with an unrestricted right to will the land in the amount set for a given area (in keeping with the land cadastre). The parcel may be confiscated only in the event of careless working of the land, but not because of illness in the lessee's family; there should be the right to voluntarily surrender the land parcel, and in this case the lessee should be paid for what he has invested in the land and built on it. (A special administrative apparatus over the lessees is not at all necessary for this: Such cases will not be numerous, and the local zemstvo will handle them.)

However, since we have now lost our feel for the land (and given our justified lack of confidence in the authorities, who have cheated us so many times), leasing may not attract the people any more. Besides, land leasing cannot stand up to economic competition with private ownership of land, which guarantees long-term improvement of the land rather than its depletion. Only with private ownership can we count on our agriculture not to be inferior to that in the West. How can we prevent independent initiatives in the case of the land while anticipating and demanding them in *all* spheres of life? Denying private property to the rural areas means giving it up forever.

However we should proceed cautiously with the introduction of private ownership. Even under Stolypin there were stringent restrictions to ensure that the land would end up with the peasants who farm it rather than large speculators or surrogates, with "joint-stock companies." Our peasant class has by now been uprooted and has died off; the anonymous speculators from the shadow economy, who have already accumulated their initial capital, have more unrestricted cunning. Our current corrupt administration is not capable of precise oversight. At present, one could almost purchase grand estates under the guise of these same "joint-stock companies," "organizations," and "cooperatives," and populate them with one's own lessees. (This is to say nothing about land purchases by foreigners.) Such purchases should not be allowed in any event. If all the land were to be snapped up by major owners, this would appreciably restrict others' lives. (Besides, we cannot allow this in anticipation of the forthcoming overpopulation of our entire planet, and this includes our country.)

Land purchases should be accomplished with preferential installment payments over many years, and tax exemptions as well. The restriction of land lots to a certain size (for a given area) by no means restricts the sense of labor or freedom of labor in itself. On the contrary, the efforts of all owners will be applied not to expanding their possessions but to improving cultivation and using intensive methods. Tiny auxiliary plots which have fed the country under a bloated kolkhoz system have already demonstrated that our people may work miracles in the process even under the most persistently oppressive restrictions by the authorities.

Size restrictions will allow land reserves so that small parcels of land can be distributed both to workers who desire to have a crop from their garden and to city dwellers who are seeking relief from their cooped-up existence. This distribution should be free of charge (as long as they farm the land!); *this* same size would also be the free segment of land for farmers who buy it.

There should be enough land for everyone.

The Economy

Stolypin said: We cannot create a rule-of-law state without first having an independent citizen: Social order is primary and prior to all political programs.

There can be no independent citizen unless there is private property.

For over 70 years it was drummed into our heads to fear property and shy away from hired labor as though it were the work of the devil—this is a great victory of Ideology over our human essence. (All the same, the entire image of the Western economy was planted in our brains as a caricature.)

However, ownership of modest property which does not suppress others is a part of the notion of individuality and provides a foundation for it. Assiduously executed and fairly paid hired labor is a form of mutual assistance of the people, and it creates good will among them.

Why else would we be hanging on to a centralized, idle, and ideologically "regulated" economy which has driven the entire country into poverty?—Just in order to maintain the parasitic apparatus which would otherwise be left entirely without a reason for being?

Of course, the blow that will be dealt to millions of unprepared and unadapted people by a transition to a market economy should be softened as much as possible. Fortunately (unfortunately!) we can contribute to this the many, many billions in hard currency outflow from the budget. We have just enumerated the items and the purposes for which we have been squandering it.

It will be six years soon, and the much-heralded healing effects of "perestroyka" have not yet reached either agriculture or industry. Meanwhile, to prolong this will mean many years of useless suffering for the people.

However it is also destructive to adopt by thoughtless emulation the alien type of economy that has evolved over there over centuries and in stages. I have no economic expertise, and the last thing I would do would be to venture specific suggestions here. Which particular procedure is possible for making a transition from entirely state-owned enterprises to private and cooperative ones; which financial provisions should be made; what exactly will remain under the control of the state from among the current state assets, including transportation, fleets, forests, water, land, and mineral wealth, and what part of them should be yielded to oblast and local jurisdiction; whose budget will provide for social security, education, and housing construction; what new labor laws will be necessary—the economists have done many specific studies on this, though they strongly disagree with each other.

However, in general it appears clear to me that we should accommodate healthy private initiative and support and protect all types of small enterprises. It is on this basis that localities will prosper most rapidly—however, we should enact laws strictly limiting the possibilities for unbridled concentration of capital and preventing the creation of monopolies and the control of some enterprises by others in all sectors. Monopolization poses the threat of the deterioration of goods: A company may allow itself to manufacture goods that do not last so that demand will be maintained. For ages, companies and owners of things took pride in how long the goods lasted. At present (in the West), there is a deafening string of still new garish models, whereas the healthy notion of *repairs* is disappearing: No sooner is a defective item discarded by necessity then a new one is bought—running counter to the human sense of self-restraint and amounting to unadulterated corruption.

We should also add to this the psychological plague of price increases, and this is happening in developed countries: While labor productivity increases, prices rise instead of falling! This is more a devouring economic fire than it is progress. (The old Russia lived for centuries with prices unchanged.)

We cannot allow an onslaught of ownership and profiteering to turn into a social evil which undermines the health of the society. It is necessary to regulate excessive growth within the confines of any type of production by antitrust legislation, through expressly progressive taxes. The banks are necessary as operational centers of financial life, but they should be prevented from turning into usurious appendages and becoming the hidden masters of all life.

Likewise, in general it appears clear that doling out our mineral wealth, our land surface, or, in particular, our forests, to foreign capitalists in a way that enslaves us should not be the price we have to pay for abandoning communism. The most dangerous idea of all is to try to rescue with foreign capital what has been jeopardized by our internal disarray. Foreign capital will flow to our country if it discovers that it can generate high profit margins here. However, if we entice Western capital to our country on terms that are beneficial to them and humiliating to us—come and rule us, please—we will not be able to rectify this sell-out later, we will turn into a colony. (However: During the three quarters of this century we have spent under the Soviets, we have stooped to the level of a colony—what else would you call it?...) Foreign capital should be allowed in within strict limits so that the economic invigoration it brings will not be canceled out either by the exported profits or the destruction of our natural environment. This will enable us to gain speed, qualitatively catching up with the developed countries.

However, the labor qualities of our people have not been completely trampled down and forgotten. We have seen the Japanese come out of their decline and even soar, because of their high work ethic rather than shots in the arm from foreign countries. The quality of labor will improve immediately, and our jacks-of-all-trades will excel everywhere as soon as state oppression, which affects our every action, is eliminated and remunerations are fair. Even if it takes a long time for us to attain a level at which our goods are in demand internationally, it is possible for a country the size of ours, with our wealth, to get by with its domestic market for a long time.

But, obviously, no normal economic life is possible as long as we continue to be slaves to the "residence permits" issued by the militia.

All of us must learn to respect healthy, honest, and intelligent private trade (and be able to distinguish it from profiteering built on bribery and theft from worthless management): Such trade enlivens society and holds it together; it is one of the first things we need.

I am by no means taking it upon myself to make proposals regarding financial, budget, and tax issues. However, it is clear that, along with strict and environmental-protection oversight and appreciable fines for damaging the environment, there should be financial incentives for all efforts aimed at restoring nature and bringing back traditional crafts.

The Provinces

Whether our country will or will not ever become prosperous depends decisively on our provinces rather than Moscow, Petrograd, Kiev, or Minsk. The key to a country's viability and its culture's vitality is to liberate the provinces from the pressure of the capitals, and the capitals, these sickly giants, would also be liberated from the excessive, unnecessary burden of their size and their boundless functions, which rob them of their normal life as well. Nor have they retained their moral justification for taking over the renewal of the country, having for 60 years surrendered the provinces to hunger, humiliation, and inconsequentiality.

The economies and cultures of *all* our provinces, *all* the expanse of the Union of Russia, should be allowed to breathe absolutely freely, in addition to having a strong (and increasingly weighty) self-government. Our motherland will not be able to live by its own values unless, for example, 40 centers of life and light for their lands, dispersed throughout its breadth and width, are reinforced. Each of these centers would be a focus of economic activity, culture, education, self-contained libraries, and publishing houses, so that the entire surrounding population would be able to receive full-value cultural sustenance, and the young people of the surrounding area would receive everything necessary for their education and development of a quality not inferior to that in the capitals.

The uniqueness of the surrounding land will be reawakened around each of these 40 cities. Only with life dispersed this way will the ruined local roads and towns and surrounding villages be restored and new ones built.

This is particularly important for the boundless Great Siberia, which we have mindlessly crippled from the very first five-year plans on instead of developing for its own good.

In this case, as in many others, the path to our healing begins at the grass roots.

The Family and the School

As urgent as everything that portends peril today might be, it is even more urgent to lay the foundations for that which takes time to grow: Over these years of our comprehensive catching up—what will be ripening in our children? From medical services and early childhood rearing to education? After all, unless we improve *this* right away, there will be no future.

In our country everyone knows about and by now everyone is talking about the catastrophic situation of women. There is no difference in interpretation in this matter, and there is nothing to prove—with respect to the declining birth rate, infant mortality, diseases of the newborn, and the terrifying condition of maternity wards, nurseries, and day-care centers.

Normal families have almost ceased to exist in our country. And family ills comprise the illness of the backbone of the state. At present, families are the main element in the salvation of our future. Women should have the opportunity to return to their families to rear children, and men should earn the corresponding amounts of money. (However, given the expected unemployment of the initial period, it will not be possible to accomplish this in exactly this way: Some families will be happy to have at least the wife keep her job for now.)

The schools are an equally urgent concern of ours. How we have tampered with them over these 70 years!—but only in rare years have they produced knowledgeable people, and then they were knowledgeable only about certain subjects, and then only a certain set of them, and only in select schools in large cities. As far as a provincial Lomonosov, moreover a country Lomonosov, is concerned, at present there is no way for him to take his place or elbow his way in, there are no paths open to him (first of all, there is the "residence permit"). The elevation of the schools should occur not only in the best capital city but through our persistent movement from the lowest level over the entire expanse of our motherland. This task is by no means less urgent than all our economic tasks. Our schools have long been giving poor instruction and failing to develop good behavior. It is impermissible for the position of classroom teacher to be an additional burden for which the pay is negligible: It should be compensated for by a reduction of the required teaching load. Our current curricula and textbooks in the humanities are all destined to be comprehensively reworked, if not discarded. The atheistic indoctrination must be stopped immediately.

And we must also begin with the teachers rather than the children. After all, we drove all of *them* below the subsistence level into poverty; those men who had the opportunity left teaching positions for better pay. And yet school teachers should be the select segment of the nation, those with a *vocation*: They are entrusted with our entire future. (In what institutes have we trained our current teachers and what kind of ideological nonsense have we taught them? We should begin to make changes and save true knowledge with the curricula of these institutes.)

Apparently, in the near future we can expect to see private commercial schools which will keep ahead of the overall progress of the rest of the schools with a view to reinforcing specific subjects and aspects of education. However, these schools should not have irresponsible, arbitrary curricula. They should be under the supervision and control of the zemstvo educational organs.

Our young people, whom families and schools have overlooked, are growing in the direction of thoughtless, barbaric emulation of anything enticing coming from alien parts, if not in the direction of crime. The historic Iron Curtain has protected our country superbly from everything good that exists in the West: From the lack of civil restrictions, respect for the individual, variety of personal activities, universal well-being, and charitable movements. However, this Curtain did not reach all the way down, and this is where the liquid manure of debased, degraded, "mass-pop-culture," most vulgar fashions, and excessive public displays seeped through. It was this waste that our impoverished, unfairly deprived young people swallowed greedily: Young people in the West go crazy from their full stomachs, while our young people thoughtlessly emulate their games. Our current television obediently carries these streams of filth all over the country. (Objecting to all of this is believed to be hard-boiled conservatism in our country. However it is instructive to note that alarmed voices can be heard concerning a similar phenomenon in Israel: "The Hebrew cultural revolution was not accomplished just for our country to capitulate to American cultural imperialism and its by-products," "Western intellectual trash.")

By now everything is known and has been written about many times: that the wealth of books in our libraries is going to ruin, that reading rooms are half empty, and that museums are neglected. All of *them* need assistance from the state; they cannot make a living from their ticket sales, as do theaters, movies, and art exhibits. (However sports should not be financed by the state with a view to gaining fame around the world, but only to the degree that they collect money themselves; ordinary calisthenics and athletic development should be provided in schools.)

Is the State System Responsible for Everything

We have to admit that the entire 20th century has been cruelly forfeited by our country; the achievements we have trumpeted have all been illusory. We have been thrown back from a prosperous condition to semibarbarity. We are sitting on the ruins.

We are now passionately discussing which state structure will suit us from now on and which will not. Supposedly, everything will hinge on this. One more thing: Which new trenchant party or "front" is to lead us to success now?

But to rise up today does not mean merely to find the most convenient form of state system and hastily compose a wonderful constitution for it, from paragraph 1 to paragraph 45. We must be more perspicacious than our ill-fated fathers and grandfathers of the year 1917, we must not replicate the chaos of the historic February, we must not once again allow ourselves to be manipulated by enticing slogans and impassioned orators, we must not voluntarily put ourselves to shame once again.

A resolute change of power requires responsibility and consideration. Not every new scheme necessarily leads to immediate benefit. Our incomparable critics of the state system in 1916 who gained power several months later, in 1917, turned out to be absolutely unprepared to accept it and failed all the way around. There is nothing to suggest that the leaders now arising will prove to be sober and astute right away. Witness a victorious critic of the filthy *system* (which is what he called it out of solicitous caution) showing insensitivity to the motherland, which is sustaining the capital, as soon as he got down to business. For 60 years now Moscow has been fed at the expense of the hungry country. Since the beginning of the 1930's it has tacitly consented to be bribed by the authorities and share in the advantages. For this reason it has become a kind of privileged island, whose material and cultural conditions are different from those in the rest of native Russia. This is why the mentality of the Moscow public who had the ability to speak has changed; for decades they have failed to air the true ills of the country.

Here we are, failing to notice amid simmering rallies and emerging miniparties that we have donned the circus attire of February—of those unfortunate eight months of the year 1917. On the other hand, some people have indeed noticed this and are exclaiming with blind elation: "Another February Revolution!" (To make the coincidence more striking, the black flags of the anarchists are already prominent.)

After a cannibalistic period that lasted three-quarters of a century, now that we have already paid so dearly, and now that it has so happened that we have ended up at the extreme end of the state spectrum, where central power is strongest—should we rashly hurry to shift into chaos: Anarchy is the *first* peril, as the year 1917 taught us.

If we do not hunger for a revolution, the state should definitely continue on smoothly and be stable. The already created statute of potentially strong presidential power will turn out to be useful for us for many years to come. Given our current accumulation of troubles, which are further complicated by the unavoidable separation from the peripheral republics, it is impossible for us to undertake to make decisions about the state structure immediately together with land, food, housing, property, finance, and the Army. Something in the current state system will have to be accepted for now for the simple reason that it exists.

Of course, we are going to recombine the state organism gradually. This should not begin everywhere at once, but from a point. It is clear that it should begin with **the grass roots, the field.** Under a strong central power, we must patiently and persistently bolster the rights of *local* life.

Of course we will gradually adopt a certain political form. Given our complete lack of political experience, most likely it will not be successful right away, and it will not be best suited for the specific needs of our country immediately. We should be looking for *our own* path. At

present we are trying to convince ourselves that we need not look for our own path or contemplate anything; we need only to adopt "the way they do it in the West" as soon as possible.

However, the way they do it in the West is actually very many ways! Every country has its own tradition. We are the only ones who need not either look back or listen to what the wise people of our country were saying before we were even born.

Let us put it another way: The state structure is secondary to the very atmosphere of human relations. Given human nobility, any decent system is permissible; given human anger and self-seeking behavior, even the most extensive democracy is unbearable. If people themselves lack fairness and honesty, this will be manifested under any system.

Political life is by no means man's main style of life, politics is by no means the desired occupation for the majority. The more intensive the political life in a country, the more spiritual life will be forfeited. Politics should not swallow up the people's spiritual energies and creative leisure time. In addition to *rights*, man needs to protect his soul and liberate it for a life of wisdom and feeling.

But What About Us?

The level of a society's spiritual life is more of a source of power or powerlessness than its level of industrial development. A market economy alone, or even universal abundance, cannot be the crowning achievement of humanity. The purity of social relations is more fundamental than the level of abundance. If a nation's spiritual force is depleted, not even the best state structure or any amount of industrial development will save its life. Of all possible freedoms the freedom to be unconscionable will still come to the fore. Alas, a *pure* atmosphere cannot be created for a society by legal means.

The destruction of **souls** for three quarters of a century is the most frightening thing.

It is frightening that the corrupt ruling class, the million-strong party and the state nomenklatura, is incapable of foregoing any of the privileges they have usurped. The nomenklatura have lived for decades without a conscience, at the expense of the people, and they would like things to continue this way.

Who of the former executioners and persecutors have been forced out of their positions or deprived of undeserved generous retirement benefits? We loved Molotov until he died, and now also Kaganovich and many nameless people. In Germany all such people, and even less important ones, were put on trial. On the other hand, in our country *they* are now threatening others with trials, and some of them are having monuments built to themselves, such as the villainous Chekist Berzin—at present! How can we punish state criminals? We will not live to see them repent even a little. May they at least be subjected to a public moral trial. No, apparently nothing will come of that either...

What about the glorious driving forces of glasnost and perestroyka? The word **catharsis** is not a fashionable one. Therefore all tainted voices which have served totalitarianism for decades have rushed to the new glasnost. Three out of every four troubadours of today's glasnost are the recent sycophants of Brezhnevism. Who among them has said a word about *his own* atonement instead of cursing impersonal "stagnation"? The same people who have for decades befuddled the consciousness of students continue to communicate self-confidently from their chairs of the humanities in schools of higher learning. Tens of thousands of the educated ones have been sullied by hypocrisy and a turncoat mentality, and we do not expect any of them to repent. So is all this spiritual filth to tag along behind us into the future?

What about the soul-corrupting barracks dedovshchina [mistreatment and abuse of recruits] of our sons? Will this ever be erased from their memories?

What about our people's universal bitterness toward one another? Just like that, for no reason, toward those who are guilty of nothing.

Should we be surprised by an explosion of common crime among those for whom honest ways have been blocked all their young lives?

Russian merchants of old had their *merchants' word* (transactions were concluded without written contracts), they had Christian notions and their historically renowned charity—will we live to see anything like this from the sharks bred in our troubled Soviet waters?

Before economic prosperity came to West Germany, it was filled with the air of atonement. In our country we have not even begun to atone. In our country the same old heavy, plump clusters of lies hang in festoons over all of our glasnost, and we act as though we do not notice them.

If so, our development will be distorted.

We would like to be uplifted by the beneficent potential of the Church. Alas, even now, when everything in the country has been set in motion, the quickening of courage has had little effect on the Orthodox hierarchy. (At a time of universal poverty one must give up the attributes of wealth with which power entices us.) The Church will not help us with our social healing until it finds within itself the courage to cast off completely the yoke of the state and restore the living bond with the feelings of the entire people which glowed brightly even at the height of the Year 1917, when Metropolitans Tikhon and Veniamin were elected, and when the Church synod was convened. Now would be the time to provide an example of fearlessness in keeping with the commandment of Christ, and not only with respect to the state, but also with respect to society, the burning

issues of the present day, and the Church itself. Resurrectionist movements are expected in this sphere, as in all the rest of our life, and they have already begun—*from the grass roots*, from the rank-and-file clergy, from united parishes, and self-sacrificing parishioners.

Self-Restraint

"Human rights" is the most fashionable slogan now, and we all repeat it eagerly. (But we all mean very different things by it. The intellectuals of the capital city understand: freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, and emigration, but many would be outraged and would demand that "rights" be banned as the simple people understand them: the right to have a dwelling and work in the same place where they eat—which would cause millions to inundate the capital cities.)

"Human rights" are very good, but how should we ensure for *ourselves* that our rights would not be expanded to the detriment of the rights of others. A society with unbridled rights cannot withstand trials. If we do not want coercive power over us, everybody must keep himself in check. No constitutions, laws, or voting alone will balance a society, because it is human to persistently pursue one's own interests. A majority, if it has the power to expand and grab, will do just that. (This is what brought down all the ruling classes and groups in history.) A stable society cannot be attained through balance of forces but rather through conscious self-restraint: Through our always having the obligation to yield to ethical justice.

The ever proliferating and ever more crowded humanity may only continue to exist if it has self-restraint. All of its long development will have been for nought unless it is imbued with the spirit of self-restraint: Even animals have the freedom to grab and obtain satisfaction. But human freedom includes voluntary self-restraint in favor of others. Our responsibilities should always be above the freedom granted to us.

May we succeed in imbuing ourselves with the spirit of self-restraint and, most importantly, be capable of passing it on to our children. It is for man himself, for the balance and purity of his soul, that self-restraint is required the most.

Then the inner opportunities are manifold. For example, hunger for the truth is natural after our protracted utter ignorance: to learn more and more of the truth about what exactly has happened to us. However, some people are already noticing, and others will notice soon, that on top of this the current unendurable stream of information, by now excessive and trivial, reduces our soul to nothingness, and at some point we will have to apply self-restraint because of it. In the contemporary world, there are increasing numbers of different newspapers, all of them becoming ever thicker, and all of them competing to overload us; there are increasing numbers of TV channels, and during the day to boot (in Iceland, for instance, they have given up all TV at least once a week). There is the sound of more and more propaganda, commercials, and entertainment. (Our country is to this day being worn out by piercing loudspeakers over its expanses.) How can we protect *the right* of ears to silence, the right of eyes to inner vision?

For our country a measured way out of its series of misfortunes—which Russia may or may not be able to accomplish now—will be more difficult than shaking off the Tatar yoke: The very backbone of the people was not broken then, and its Christian faith was not undermined then.

In 1754, under Elizabeth, Petr Ivanovich Shuvalov proposed the surprising *Project of Preserving the People.*

Was he a crank?

Yet this is what state wisdom is all about.

Further Ahead

There is no hope that after the present time of troubles some "quiet" time will come when we will be able to "sit down and think" about how to arrange our future. The process of history is continuous, and nobody will grant us the privilege of such intermissions, just as they did not let the Constituent Assembly "sit down and think." No matter how crucial the present day is, we must think about our future structure in advance. (In my case, my age makes me doubt that I will be able to participate in the discussion of these issues.)

Before the revolution the bulk of our people did not have political notions, and the things that have been drummed into our heads through propaganda for 70 years have produced only befuddlement. Now that we have started moving toward developing political life in our country, and the forms of future power are already being discussed, it is useful to clarify the content of certain terms in order to avoid possible mistakes.

On the Form of the State

Oswald Spengler was right in pointing out that the very *sense* of the state differs from culture to culture, and that there are no certain "best" forms of the state which one great culture should borrow from another. Montesquieu said that there is a specific form of government for every spatial size of a state, and one cannot transplant a form with impunity, regardless of the size of the country.

For a *specific* people, with its geography, with the history it has gone through, its traditions, and psychological makeup, a system should be established which would lead to its prosperity rather than its degeneration. The state structure should definitely take the people's traditions into account. "This is what the Lord says: Stand at the crossroads and look; ask for the ancient paths, ask where the good way is, and walk in it." (Jeremiah 6:16).

The people have an unquestionable right to power, but what the people want is not power (only a small proportion of them hunger for it) but above all a stable order. Even the Christian socialist, G.P. Fedotov, insisted after

the experience of 1917 that authorities should be strong and even, as he wrote: They should not depend on a council of legislators, and they should report to one only after a sufficient period of time. (Perhaps this is too much.)

If we opt to structure the institutions of freedom from *below*, which is proposed further on, keeping the formal features of central power as they are, this will take a number of years, and we will still have time to discuss in depth the healthy rules for structuring the state.

At present, we may refer to the future only in terms of conjecture, leaving room for our forthcoming experience and new reflections. The final form of the state (if there can be a *final* form at all) is a matter of successive approximations and tests.

Plato, and Aristotle after him, discerned and named three possible types of state systems. In the normal sequence, these are monarchy, the power of one; aristocracy, the power of the best or for the best purposes; and polity, the power of the people in a small city-state exercised in the common interest (we now call it democracy). They were also the ones who warned about the forms of degradation of all of these types into tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy—the power of the crowd (we now call it mob rule), respectively. All three forms may be good if they rule for the public good, and all three are distorted when they pursue private interests.

It appears that nobody has actually created anything since then that has not fit this pattern; it was merely augmented by constitutional forms. If we were to disregard the form of complete lack of authority (anarchy, the power of anyone who is strong over anyone who is weak) and avoid being caught again in the trap of totalitarianism, which was invented in the 20th century, we could not say that we have much choice: Judging from the entire flow of modern times, we will opt for democracy.

However, in opting for democracy, we must clearly understand exactly what we are opting for and at what price, and that we are choosing this as a means rather than an end. Modern philosopher Karl Popper said that we select democracy not because it abounds in virtues but in order to avoid tyranny; we select it being aware of its shortcomings and searching for ways to overcome them.

It was in our time that democracy was elevated from a form of state structure into a universal principle of human existence of sorts, almost a cult, despite the fact that also in our time many young countries experienced collapse, having just introduced democracy.

Still, let us try to trace the exact meaning of this term.

What Democracy Is and Is Not

Alexis de Tocqueville considered the notions of democracy and freedom to be opposites. He was an ardent proponent of freedom, but not at all of democracy. J.S. Mill perceived the danger of "tyranny of the majority" in an unrestricted democracy, whereas for an individual it makes no difference whether he submits to a single tyrant or a plurality.

G. Fedotov wrote that democracy has been distorted by the atheistic materialism of the 19th century which has beheaded humanity. The Austrian statesman of our century, Josef Schumpeter, called democracy a surrogate faith for an intellectual deprived of religion, and warned that democracy cannot be viewed without regard for the country and the time it is being applied in.

The Russian philosopher S.A. Levitskiy proposed to distinguish between:

the spirit of democracy 1) freedom of personality; 2) rule-of-law state; and its secondary, non-mandatory attributes of: 1) a parliamentary system; 2) universal suffrage. The two last principles are not at all evident.

Respect for the individual is a broader principle than democracy, and this respect must definitely be ensured. However, it is not mandatory to respect the individual only in the form of a parliamentary system.

However, the rights of individuals should not be elevated so high as to eclipse the rights of the society. Pope John Paul II stated (in a speech in the Philippines, 1981) that in the event of a conflict between national security and human rights, national security should take precedence, that is, the integrity of a more general structure in whose absence the lives of individuals will fall apart too.

This is how President Ronald Reagan expressed it (speech at the University of Moscow, 1988): Democracy is a way of restricting the government so that it *will not interfere* with the development of *the main values* of the individual as fostered by the family and faith rather than by a form of government.

At present, the word "democracy" is the most fashionable one in our country. They shout it from the rooftops, ring it, and rattle it in all ways (and speculate on it).

However, there is no evidence that we have given a lot of thought to its exact meaning.

Following the bitter experience of 1917, when we flopped down into the middle of what we believed to be democracy, our prominent Cadet [Constitutional Democrats] leader, V.A. Maklakov, admitted and reminded us all: "Democracy requires a certain amount of political discipline on the part of the people."

In the year 1917, we did not have it, and now, perhaps, we have even less of it.

Universal—Equal—Direct—Secret

When in 1937 Stalin introduced our caricature "elections" he was also compelled to give them the appearance of universal—equal—direct—secret elections

("four tails")—a procedure which appears as indisputable in the present-day world as a law of nature. Meanwhile, even after the first French Revolution (Constitution of 1791), that was not the way voting was: Restrictions and inequality in terms of various qualifications remained. The idea of universal suffrage did not prevail in France until the 1848 revolution. In England, prominent fighters for "a constitutional order" came forward throughout the 19th century—such order as to ensure that no majority would be a tyrant over a minority, and that in parliament the entire variety of social strata, of those who are respected and aware of their responsibility to the country would be represented. This was the task of preserving the foundations from which the country grew. After 1918, England also slid toward universal suffrage.

Dostoyevskiy considered universal-equal elections to be "the most nonsensical invention of the 19th century." At any rate, it is not Newton's law, and it is permissible to question its properties. "Universal and equal"—what about the extreme inequality of personalities, talents, their contributions to public life, different ages, different experiences of life, and different degrees of being rooted in a particular area and country? That is to say, the triumph of quantity without content over quality with content. In addition, such elections ("by the general citizenry") presuppose an *unstructured* nation—that it is not a living organism but a mechanical collection of disjointed units.

"Secret" is no adornment either. It facilitates mental disingenuousness or, alas, caters to fear. However, there are places on earth where people vote openly even now.

"Direct" (i.e. deputies of all levels are elected directly at the lower ballot boxes) is particularly debatable in a country as immense as ours. It dooms voters to *not knowing* their deputies, and those who are faster talkers or who have powerful behind-the-scenes support have an advantage.

All peculiarities of the electoral system and modes of counting votes were discussed in Russia in a most detailed manner by commissions and party committees in the spring and summer of 1917. It was because of this that the Constituent Assembly missed its chance. All democratic parties came out against elections in four, three, or even two stages because in these elections a chain of personal knowledge of the candidates is extended, the elected representatives are more closely associated with their domiciles, "with their home turf." This deprives all parties of the opportunity to field candidates from the center. Cadet leader P.N. Milyukov insisted that only *direct* elections from *large* districts would "ensure the election of intelligent and politically aware representatives."

It depends on who needs what.

Methods of Voting

The objective of a universal vote is to determine the Will of the People: the genuine Will which will direct everything in the manner best for the people. Does this unified Will exist, and what is it? Nobody knows. However, it is remarkable that with different systems of vote counting we find this will to be different and even contradictory.

At this point it does not appear important to a majority in our country exactly how the system of voting is arranged. Yet it has a significant influence.

At least three systems of counting compete in the world: A proportionate representation system, simple majority system, and absolute majority system.

Elections under the proportionate representation system are held in hardly any other way than with *tickets* (of course, they are party tickets): In every district (for several deputy seats at once; this way is more convenient for campaigning and monitoring) each party proposes a list of candidates. An individual candidate is relieved of personal responsibility to the voters by this alone, and is responsible only to the party; for their part, the voters are deprived of the chance to elect their own specific representative whom they trust, and can vote only for a party. (Two subsystems are distinguished: "fixed tickets," whereby a voter is not allowed to rearrange the list in the order of desirability; the party makes the selection itself. This method is used in particular when the literacy rate of the population is low. There is also the subsystem of "free tickets," whereby a voter may give preference to candidates within the ticket or even submit his own ticket, which, to be sure, makes the counting techniques very difficult. There is a third variant whereby districts are divided into subdistricts, with just one name in each, but a district commission subsequently takes a count by party anyway and, on a proportionate basis, allots seats to the parties rather than the individuals. In all cases the selection of *individuals* is up mainly to the parties.)

In 1917, all parties from the Cadets to the Bolsheviks preferred this very method, and with multicandidate districts to boot. This was strongly endorsed by the influential Cadet, I.V. Gessen: It is most convenient for the parties to organize and act in this manner whereas "under a system of individual candidate elections the leading role frequently eludes the parties." The V.I. Ulyanov-Lenin whom we all know also approved of this: He referred to the method when "party representatives rather than particular individuals" are elected as "one of the most advanced methods of election." Apparently, he had a reason for liking this method. Proportionate elections with tickets excessively reinforce the power of party echelons which compile the list of candidates and give the advantage to large and well organized parties. This is particularly advantageous for the parties because they may tuck their central activists away in remote districts where they do not reside and thus ensure their election. The Cadet congress in the summer of 1917 particularly insisted on this—that the candidates not be

required to reside in their districts. This "gives the Central Committee the opportunity to centralize the elections." All other parties also insisted on the same, so to speak, *centralized democracy.*

Under the system of proportionate representation, small minorities may usually be given some voice in a representative assembly. However, a multitude of parliamentary factions is created, and energies are wasted on squabbling. Or else this prompts the parties to improve their situation through unprincipled coalitions which entail exceptions to their programs—as long as they gain votes and control of the government. In today's world, there are striking examples of such state weakness and protracted government crises.

Under the simple majority system, such unnatural compromises between the parties also occur, but as blocs formed even before the elections. Under this system, the party (or the bloc) which is barely ahead of the others receives an overwhelming number of seats. However if one is barely behind there is a total loss: Winning 49 percent of the votes may not win any parliamentary seats. Given an imprecise distribution of electoral districts, it may happen that the simple majority system gives the victory to a minority. This was the case, for example, in France in 1893, 1898, and 1902: Some of the victorious deputies won fewer votes than the defeated candidates did: In the last two cases, 63 percent of the voters were not represented in the chamber of deputies at all.

However, a stable government is created under this system.

The system of elections by absolute majorities (to which end a second round is possible), which is now being introduced in our country, also pushes out small parties, but provides the opportunity to bargain with votes between the first and second rounds.

Under a two-party system, as in the United States, independent candidates resolve nothing. The voters give their votes to one of the two parties (both have strong party apparatuses and the richest support). Under this system, social dissatisfaction finds an outlet, though not right away, not always, and not within one election campaign. However, the outlet is negative: Just change this party that is in power, without any guarantees as to what its replacements will do.

Therefore, the composition of the government and its program which, of course, expresses the Will of the People, may change strikingly due to merely changing the method of counting votes.

In general, any voting, with any method of counting, is not a search for the truth. In this instance, everything boils down to numbers, to a simplified mathematical concept, to a minority being swallowed up by a majority, and this is a dangerous instrument: A minority is no less important to a society than a majority, and a majority may be led into deception. "Do not follow the crowd in doing wrong. When you give testimony in a lawsuit, do not pervert justice by siding with the crowd." (Exodus 23:2)

In addition, election campaigns involving large numbers of voters, conducted among the unfamiliar electorate, become so fussy, shrill, and on top of that frequently with biases on the part of the mass media, that they even turn off an appreciable segment of the population. Television might reveal the appearance of a candidate and his demeanor, but not his abilities as a statesman. Every such election campaign brings about a vulgarization of state thinking. Talent and creativity are required for beneficially successful power—is it easy to elect them by a universal vote on broad expanses? In and of itself, such a system does not compel political figures to act above their political interests, and even the other way around, he who proceeds from moral principles may very well lose.

A. de Tocqueville, who studied the United States in the 19th century, came to the conclusion that democracy means the dominance of mediocrity. (However the extraordinary circumstances of that country bring strong individuals to the fore as well.)

Popular Representation

As soon as he is elected, a candidate becomes a *people's representative.*

The democracy of Athens rejected all "representation" as a variety of oligarchy. However, it could allow itself this in view of its small size.

On the other hand, the French General Assembly, as soon as it assembled in 1789, adopted a law to the effect that from then on every deputy was merely a part of this collective body *which represents the precise will of the people.* In this manner, all deputies were severed from their voters and from their personal responsibility to them.

Our four consecutive State Dumas did little to express the depths and breadths of Russia; they merely expressed the narrow strata of several cities. A majority of the population did not actually grasp the meaning of those elections and those parties. Our brilliant Duma figure, V. Maklakov, admitted that "the will of the people" is a fiction even under democracy: A mere majority decision in parliament is taken to be the people's will.

Besides, it is impossible for the people to give precise instructions to their deputies covering all unpredictable future occasions. Nor is there an impulse which would make current elected representatives rise above the interests of their *future* election, and above party combinations, to serve only the thoroughly interpreted interests of the motherland, even if (and, actually, unavoidably) it was to the detriment of themselves and their party. What the electorate likes on the surface is done, even if this is an evil to them in its profound and long-term significance. In a state as large as ours, there is all the less

chance for checking on elected representatives and all the more opportunity for abuses by them. There is no control mechanism above them; there is merely the opportunity to try to defeat them in the next elections. The popular majority is left without other influence on the course of governing the state. (After all, the trustees may not have more rights than those who delegate authority to them, be it civil or commercial representation; the trustees lose their mandate if they do not execute it honestly.)

However, it is paradoxical anyway: Under the frequently used system whereby a government is formed on the basis of a parliamentary majority, members of this majority cease to be independent people's representatives counterbalancing the government. Instead, they serve the government with all their power and reinforce it, keeping it going at any price. That is to say: The legislators are subordinated to executive power.

(Incidentally, the principle of *complete* separation of legislative, executive, and judicial power is not unassailable: Does this not amount to the disintegration of a living state organism? All three of the disjointed powers need some kind of unifying control over themselves—ethical control if not formal control.)

One more thing: All election techniques require that people have one set of qualities, and steering the state requires altogether different ones which have nothing in common with the former. It seldom happens that an individual has both sets of qualities; the latter set would put him at a disadvantage in an election contest.

Meanwhile, "representation" becomes a kind of profession for people, almost for life. A class of "professional politicians" is born for whom politics will be their craft and source of income from now on. They maneuver within a system of parliamentary combinations, and this is a far cry from "the will of the people...."

What strikes one in most parliaments is the predominance of jurists and attorneys, a "jurocracy." (This is all the more true because there are so many laws, and the system of laws and legal procedure are so complicated that a common man is incapable of defending himself under the law, and he must have the expensive protection of an attorney at every turn.)

And What It Can Turn Into

Certainly, a democratic system makes it possible to closely scrutinize the actions of officials though, surprisingly, modern democracies have also spawned overgrown bureaucracies.

However, the majority does not necessarily express itself, even in general elections. The voting process is frequently feeble. In a number of Western countries, more than half the electorate and even as many as two-thirds of them at times do not turn out to vote at all, which makes the entire process rather meaningless. The number of voters is sometimes split in such a manner that a negligible advantage is achieved by throwing in a tiny, insignificant party. The future of the country or its course more or less hinge on this very party.

As a principle, this was predicted long ago by S.L. Frank: A minority rules under a democracy as well. Also, V.V. Rozanov said: "Democracy is a method whereby a well organized minority rules over the unorganized majority."

Indeed, a flexible, well tuned democracy can make the protests of common people futile and prevent them from being given a voice. There is injustice under a democracy as well, and swindlers know how to escape responsibility. These techniques pervade the offices of a democratic bureaucracy and become elusive. At present, an anxious warning is being given even from the oldest democracy in the world, the Swiss democracy (Hans Staub): That important decisions are made in anonymous and uncontrolled settings, somewhere behind the scenes, under the influence of "pressure groups," "lobbyists."

Even under universal equality under the law, the actual inequality between the rich and the poor, that is, between the stronger and the weaker, remains. (However, the level of "poverty," as currently understood in the West, is much higher than our notion of it.) Our expert on state matters. B.N. Chicherin, observed as early as the 19th century that from among all types of aristocracies one type surfaces under a democracy as well: the moneyed aristocracy. There is no denying that under a democracy money ensures real power, and the concentration in power of people with substantial fortunes is unavoidable. In the years of rotten socialism, such people have also accumulated in our country, in the "shadow economy"; they have intertwined with the top brass of officialdom. Even in the years of "perestroyka" they have grown rich in the tangle of obscure laws and are now on the starting line to go at it in public—this makes it all the more important to strictly contain all kinds of monopolies from the very beginning in order to prevent them from prevailing.

It is also depressing that the intellectual pseudo-elite spawned by our contemporary competitive public forum ridicules the absolute nature of the notions of good and evil, and covers up their indifference toward these notions by "the pluralism of ideas," and actions.

The original European democracy was imbued with the feeling of Christian responsibility and self-discipline. However, these spiritual foundations are gradually eroding. Spiritual independence is oppressed and downtrodden by a dictatorship of mediocrity, fads, and group interests.

We are embarking on democracy at a time when it is not at its healthiest.

The Parties

We have now reached a point where we cannot conceive of political life without parties any more than we can conceive of private life without a family.

One month before the October coup, Trotskiy proclaimed: "What is a party? It is a group of people who are seeking power in order to have the opportunity to carry out their program. A party which does not want power does not deserve to be called a party."

Of course, the Bolshevik Party is a unique case. But the very phenomenon of parties is ancient, and it was understood so long ago that even Titus Livius wrote in his day: "Struggle between parties is and always will be a much worse problem for the people than war, famine, plague, or any other wrath of God."

"A party" means *a part*. Splitting into parties means that we split into parts. As a part of the people, who does a party oppose? Obviously, the rest of the people who have not followed it. Every party works primarily for itself and its own rather than for the entire nation. National interests are eclipsed by the goals of the party, and primarily by what one's own party needs in order to be reelected the next time. If something that is useful for the state and the people originates from a party hostile to us, it is permissible not to support it. The interests of the parties and even their very existence are by no means identical to the interests of the voters. S. Kryzhanovskiy believed that the flaws and even demise of parliamentary systems occur precisely because of the parties which reject national unity and the very notion of the motherland. Party struggles supplant more than just a search for the truth—the stake in them is the party prestige and the conquest of slices of executive power. The top brass of political parties inevitably turn into oligarchies. To whom do the parties report apart from their own committees?—Such bodies are not envisaged by any constitution.

The rivalry of parties distorts the will of the people. The principle of party loyalty in itself suppresses individuality and its role; any party means simplifying and vulgarizing individuality. People have views but parties have ideologies.

In view of this, what can we wish for in the future Union of Russia?

No fundamental resolution of the fate of the state is found on the path of parties or may be entrusted to the parties. Our provinces will be finished, and our rural areas will be ultimately duped if the parties are allowed to run wild. "Professional politicians" should not be given the chance to replace the voices of the country with their own voices. An apparatus of public servants is available to draw on for all types of professional expertise.

All parties, along with all associations and unions, exist freely, express and defend any views, and may have their own press financed with their funds. (On the contrary, secret unions are subject to criminal prosecution for conspiracy against the society.) However, the interference of parties in production, service, and instruction processes is impermissible: All of these are beyond the realm of politics.

In all state elections the parties have the right to nominate candidates and campaign on their behalf, along with any independent groups, but without putting together *tickets*: It is not parties that are running but specific individuals. However, an elected candidate should withdraw from his party for his entire term in elected office if he is a member of one. He should act in keeping with his personal responsibility to the entire mass of voters. Power is a sacred trust, and it cannot be the object of competition among the parties.

As a consequence: The formation of party groups is prohibited at all levels of state representation from bottom to top. And, it goes without saying that the notion of "a ruling party" ceases to exist.

Democracy of Small Areas

The critical remarks on modern democracy stated above certainly do not mean that the future Union of Russia does not need democracy. **It is very much needed.** However, given our people's complete lack of preparation for a complex democratic life, democracy should be built up from *the grass roots* gradually, patiently, and firmly, rather than being simply proclaimed at the top of our voices and rapidly from above, in all of its width and breadth all at once.

Almost none of the flaws mentioned above apply to the democracy of small areas: A small city, a settlement, a village, a volost (a group of villages), or the confines of an uyezd (rayon). Only within these spaces will people be able to accurately determine their elected representatives, whom they know well both for their business abilities and for their spiritual qualities.

This is exactly the space within which a new Russian democracy may begin to grow, become stronger, and acquire self-awareness. This is our most vital and most correct concept for it will ensure for our locality unpolluted air and water, housing, apartments, hospitals, nurseries, schools, shops, and local supply facilities, and it will vigorously promote the growth of local, unrestricted economic initiative.

In the absence of properly constituted local self-government, there can be no prosperous and stable life, and the very notion of "civil liberty" loses meaning.

The democracy of small spaces is strong in that it is *unmediated*. Democracy is really effective where *people's assemblies* can be used rather than representative assemblies. Such assemblies date back to Athens and even earlier. Such assemblies operate at present with confidence in the United States and govern local life. I had a happy occasion to observe this in Switzerland as well in

the Canton of Appenzell. I have already written about this elsewhere but I cannot resist a brief repetition of it here. All those who are entitled to vote ("capable of bearing arms," as Aristotle suggested in his day) gathered in the town square and stood crowded together. The vote is public, with a show of hands. They reelected the head of their canton government, a landammann, very eagerly and with obvious love. However, they voted right away against three of the bills he introduced: We trust you! Rule us, but without *this*!

In his policy statement, Landammann Raymond Broger said: For more than half a millennium now, our community has not substantially changed the form of its self-government. We are guided by the conviction that *freedom* is associated with our obligations and our self-restraint. Neither an individual nor a state may have freedom in the absence of discipline and honesty. The people are the decisive judge on all significant issues, but they cannot be present on a daily basis in order to rule the state. This is why an admixture of an aristocratic or even monarchist element is unavoidable in government. (Aristotle said the same thing.) Broger went on to say that the government should not be in a hurry to follow the fluctuating and changeable popular vote just to get reelected, it should not make enticing speeches before voters, but should move against the current. The task of the government: to act as a wise popular majority would act if it knew all the details of everything—meanwhile, this is becoming increasingly impossible given the increasingly excessive burden on the state. It is in a democratic system that a firm hand is needed, which may steer the ship of state on a precise course.

The democracy of small spaces existed in Russia for centuries. Through the centuries this is what the rural Russian mir [peasant community] was, and in some periods, the city veches [popular assemblies in medieval Russian towns] and the Cossack self-government were this as well. One more form of this kind of democracy, the *zemstvo*, grew from the end of the last century and evolved a great deal. Unfortunately, this was only the uyezd and provincial level of zemstvo, without the roots of the volost zemstvo and without being crowned with an all-Russian zemstvo. The October coup forcibly tore down all zemstvos, replacing them with *soviets* which have been under the thumb of the Communist Party from the very beginning. These Soviets degraded themselves throughout their entire history since 1918: They never amounted to genuine self-government at any level. The timid changes in election laws which are now being made are likewise unable to save this form: The latter does not ensure the influence of *local* interests through the entire structure from top to bottom. I think that "the soviets of deputies" should be replaced with a zemstvo system from bottom to top, step by step.

Having studied the state history of prerevolutionary Russia for many years, I am drawing here on the experience of our best minds and practitioners, fusing it with my own modest contribution. Of course, that experience cannot be easily transplanted into our present tattered country in which the very foundations of life are distorted. However, without this experience our ascendance is not likely to proceed in a healthy manner.

Here I am also using prerevolutionary Russian notions and expressions in order not to construct an additional third sequence of notions. Life will replace some of them and others will take root.

The Zemstvo

Let us distinguish four levels of the zemstvo:

—a local zemstvo (a small city, the rayon of a large city, a settlement, a volost)

—an uyezd zemstvo (a present-day rayon, a large city)

—an oblast zemstvo (an oblast, an autonomous republic)

—an all-Russian (all-Union) zemstvo.

We, the people who have been weaned away from genuine self-government, must gradually become accustomed to this movement, starting at its lowest levels. God save us from footloose political operators, but it is useful for many, many people among the populace to have political abilities.

Only individuals may be voted on. They are usually well known to the voters within the local zemstvos. It is desirable for the election campaigns to be as limited and brief as possible: There should be merely a businesslike statement of political programs, biographies, and opinions. No state funds should be spent for this procedure, and local funds should be spent at the discretion of local forces. Likewise, many procedural details should be resolved locally, and they may differ greatly from one area to another.

However, the following should be mandatory everywhere:

1) **The age requirement.** How old must a voter be in order to be allowed to participate in deciding the fate of the people? In our time, immature youth fail to receive stable upbringing either at home or in school. Their educational baggage is superficial, and at times they are vulnerable to the most irresponsible influences. Should the age be raised to 20? (This age may be raised at the option of localities or national oblasts.) For being elected—30 years and older? 28 years and older?

2) **The residency requirement.** Both the voters and, even more so, those who are elected should have roots in a given locality, and they should be closely associated with its interests and thoroughly understand them. Recent arrivals or altogether random people cannot exercise responsible judgment in this instance. Residency for voters should be no less than the preceding three years without significant interruptions. (Each locality may establish a longer requirement for itself.) For those who are elected it should be no less than the preceding five

years (or, let us say, the preceding three years without interruption plus five years at some time prior to that.)

A certain number of legislators ("selectmen") are elected to a local zemstvo. They confirm administrative officials who answer to them on a daily basis for their activities. In a volost or a small settlement, there can be only one of these. At the uyezd level, they are the uyezd zemstvo administration, whom the uyezd zemstvo assembly delegates from among its own members or recruits from among specialists.

The newly elected zemstvo assumes the power of the existing local and rayon soviets of deputies and the latter are abolished.

Only direct elections are held for local zemstvos; for elections to uyezd zemstvos, this depends on the size of an uyezd and everyone's reliable general knowledge of the candidates. If the territory and population density are considera it is more reliable to use two-stage elections: Loca mstvos will immediately replace local soviets and will work for one-half of their term. Subsequently, having become acquainted with one another, the members will appoint from among themselves a proportionate number of representatives to the uyezd zemstvo assembly to serve until the end of the term, which is the next election. (The existence of the previous rayon soviet and rayon executive committee will be extended for this half term.)

No body higher than the uyezd zemstvo is elected for the first term (two years?). Given our lack of political skills, the local and uyezd zemstvos will also become a school of government as they actually govern their localities. Individuals with broader horizons will begin to make themselves known and mature in these zemstvos. The example of the recent miners' strike committees and the "unions of workers" which have displayed a high degree of awareness and organization is also convincing.

Stages of the Transfer of Power

Given the geographic enormity and the conditions of existence in our country, direct all-state elections of legislators to the central parliament cannot be fruitful. Only three- or four-stage elections may advance candidates who have already proven themselves and put down roots in their localities. These are going to be elections based on mutual recognition and confidence gained after many years rather than elections from among distant people who are not well known and who merely figure in the course of an election campaign.

At the end of the first (or even second) term of office, third-level elections to the oblast zemstvo assembly are held. They are administered by the uyezd zemstvo assembly (and the zemstvo assembly of the oblast city): They nominate from their long familiar ranks a proportionate number of representatives allotted to them at the oblast level for the entire forthcoming term. Following this, they are subjected to yet another reelection.

The oblast zemstvo assembly put together in this manner immediately replaces the oblast soviet. It forms an oblast zemstvo administration instead of the oblast executive committee for executive actions. The zemstvo assembly itself meets only for regular sessions for the duration of the term of office. Between sessions assembly members reside in their uyezds. (After the entire system begins to function in a stable manner, the term of office itself may be extended everywhere.)

Here we should not ignore the advice of our outstanding zemstvo figure D.N. Shipov: With a view to correcting eventual oversights due to random occurrences in elections, every assembly has the right to co-opt, by complete consensus rather than by voting, generally known useful and necessary local figures, in numbers not to exceed one-fifth of its membership. Under future conditions, this will also open the path for some successful functionaries of the rayon soviet, the oblast soviet, and subsequently the Supreme Soviet to be easily included among the new authorities.

The more authoritative the oblast zemstvo is, the stronger the corresponding independence and self-reliance of autonomous national republics will be.

Without venturing to anticipate the role and position of the current Supreme Soviets of the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and Belorussia, it is natural to suggest that by the next term oblast zemstvo assemblies will nominate from among themselves delegates to the Union Chamber (which will replace the Soviet of the Union) of the All-Zemstvo Assembly (which will replace the Supreme Soviet of deputies), and will themselves be reelected on the same principle by the uyezd assemblies.

The current system of chambers of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities endowed with equal rights would not be bad at all if it were put together with without pretense or finagling. The Chamber of Nationalities could remain in the All-Zemstvo Assembly without any changes at all—provided that every nation has the latitude to decide for itself how it fills the seats allotted to it—by general elections or by powers granted on the basis of merit—and for how long a term.

The present Soviet of the Union is comprised according to a hazy, mixed principle: in part by territorial voting and in part by delegation from the CPSU and the organizations. This is unacceptable even in a period of transition (four years long? six years long?) and should be corrected somehow. Moreover, it is also cumbersome and weighed down by the Congress of Deputies, which merely duplicates and complicates legislative proceedings.

Successful construction of a zemstvo system crowned by the All-Zemstvo Assembly requires that the uyezd and oblast assemblies function and gain experience, and that oblast-level functionaries, having become well acquainted with one another, be able to nominate delegations to the All-Zemstvo Assembly (either for the duration of the term or rotating after a partial term) in

which oblast experience would merge with all-Russian experience and would be reliably represented within it. A parliament cannot be "central" in the abstract: It must consist of genuine and authoritative representatives of oblasts, also with the mandatory condition that they spend an appreciable part of the year in their local areas, or they lose their right to represent them. (This is the way it is in the United States as well.)

Combined System of Government

What is meant is a reasonable combination of the functioning of a centralized bureaucracy and social forces.

Such a combination has existed at times as early as in Muscovite Rus: Local self-government handled not only local business but even some of the state business, although it was under the supervision of the central authorities.

In 1899, S.U. Vitte prevented Nicholas II from expanding the rights of the zemstvos through a fallacious argument to the effect that autocracy is incompatible with broad local self-government. (Soon thereafter, L. Tikhomirov, a "People's Will" member [narodovolets] who was to become a monarchist, refuted this argument, but was not heard.)

A centralized bureaucracy tries to restrict the sphere of social self-government by virtue of its inertia. This, however, is necessary only for the bureaucracy itself and by no means for the people, not even for the government. In healthy times local forces have a great thirst for action and should be given the greatest possible latitude. As Tikhomirov put it, in all pursuits in which social forces are capable of maintaining comprehensive, mandatory norms themselves, the functioning of government is superfluous and even harmful because it needlessly impairs the nation's ability to act independently. Everywhere where the direct action of popular forces is permissible, be it in the form of local self-government or the functioning of other individual social associations and unions, this direct action should be allowed.

In addition, this social support is indispensable for controlling the state-bureaucratic system, and it makes any official within it serve honestly and efficiently.

D. Shipov called this combined system, this businesslike cooperation between the government administration and the administration of local self-government bodies, *the state-zemstvo system.*

However, a special correlation will evolve in the current transition period, which may not be all that short. While social forces slowly grow up from the grass roots, acquire state experience, and develop their cadres, the existing bureaucracy, which has become accustomed to unchecked all-encompassing power, will dig in its heels and do everything possible to avoid relinquishing its rights. But these rights will be unavoidably restricted due to the emergence of economic independence in the country. Moreover, constructive forces which will assist this expansion of social independence are already making their presence known in the current, newly elected soviets of the transition period.

Presumptions Regarding the Central Authorities

At present, presidential authority is by no means superfluous given the enormity of our country and the abundance of its problems. However, all the rights of the Head of State and all possible situations of conflict should be strictly envisaged in the law, and this is all the more true of procedures for the election of the president. He will acquire genuine authority only after his election by popular vote (for five years? seven years?). But with a view to this election, popular forces should not be squandered in the course of a hard and biased election campaign lasting several weeks or even months, during which the main purpose is to defame the competitor. It would suffice for the All-Zemstvo Assembly to nominate and thoroughly discuss several candidates from among the native citizens of the state who have resided in it continuously for the previous seven to 10 years. As a result of the discussion, on one occasion the All-Zemstvo Assembly would for each candidate issue a public statement of equal length on their causes and a summary of objections. A popular vote (in one or two rounds, by the method of absolute majority) could subsequently be held without an intensive, tiring election campaign. (Apparently it is reasonable to envisage the post of vice president following the American model: The candidate is chosen by the presidential candidate and they run as a team.)

If during the president's term in office the All-Zemstvo Assembly were to determine by three-fourths of the votes in each chamber that the president was discharging his duties unsatisfactorily, it would publish convincing arguments to this effect, which would be submitted to a popular vote, along with possible new candidacies. On the other hand, if after the expiration of the president's term the All-Zemstvo Assembly continued to support him by a two-thirds majority in each chamber, there would be no apparent reasons not to retain him for the next term without another popular election. If the president were to die in the second half of his term, the vice president would assume his position until the end of the term. If the president were to die in the first half of the term, another popular election would be held.

The president appoints the Council of Ministers at his discretion, preferably from among specialists hired on a competitive basis as state officials; it is not desirable to appoint members of legislative chambers. The ministers report to both the president and the two chambers, but they cannot be replaced by them (we may pay attention to the following in the program written by P.A. Stolypin just before he died: An Academy course lasting two to three years for holding higher state positions for the most gifted individuals who have graduated with distinction from institutes, with public, substantiated social or personal recommendations; the Academy would have a set

of departments corresponding to the set of ministries. Among the ministries, Stolypin distinguished the ministry of local self-government bodies—for helping the latter.)

As our legal expert V.V. Leontovich defined it, the government differs from the administration (bureaucracy) in that it performs *new* tasks, whereas the administration performs old, routine tasks. Correspondingly, the ministers are required to have qualifications of a high order; if the government itself gives in to bureaucratic ways, it will lose the ability to lead the country.

However, not all work in the administrative system should by any means be a reward or privilege, nor should it result in any personal gain. M.N. Katkov wrote: "The only fruitful government is one that regards itself as nothing other than a responsibility." After everything we have been through, any *authority* as a notion is already forever indebted to the people. Government offices should give their all in order to correct and make up for everything that has been wasted, and perhaps have a longer work day.

There are few ways in which we can emulate Switzerland, given its size and the fact that it was created as a union of independent cantons. But we can undoubtedly borrow this from it: With a certain number of signatures, it is possible to introduce a bill which the chambers must consider; given another, higher number of signatures (in our country, millions) it becomes mandatory to hold a referendum on the issue raised. Such legislative initiative of the masses adds flexibility to the life of the state.

An Advisory Structure

I am adding this chapter by no means for the sake of the current moment. However it appears to me that it is quite important for distant future of our state.

Recalling his rich experience in the Duma, V. Maklakov stated: The most durable successes of democracy are achieved by an agreement between the majority and the minority rather by the preponderance of the former over the latter. In a country without political experience, he even suggested creating *a third chamber* of parliament "consisting of the experienced and cultured minority": Creating this obstacle would interfere with the free spread of democracy, but it is less dangerous for democracy itself than the unrestricted power of the majority.

If we carry this idea a step further: Apparently we should look for a form of state decisionmaking superior to a mere mechanical vote. Submitting everything to a majority vote means establishing the dictatorship of this majority over the minority and over *separate opinions*, which are the most valuable in searching for paths of development.

A high standard of operation of all state powers cannot be attained without establishing ethical controls over them. Such controls may be exercised by a supreme moral entity with an advisory role—a structure within which voting almost never occurs but all opinions and dissenting opinions are thoroughly argued. These are the most authoritative voices that may be heard in the operation of the state.

There is a strong similarity to this in our history—the Zemstvo Assembly of Muscovite Russia. As D. Shipov wrote: When Zemstvo Assemblies met in our country there was no struggle between the Sovereign and the Assemblies, and we know no cases in which the Sovereign acted against the opinion of the Assemblies: Differing with the Assemblies would only have weakened his authority. The Assembly principle [sobornost] is a system of trust; it presupposes that moral unity is possible and attainable.

Ideally a Duma (Assembly Duma? State Duma?), comprised of, as it were, the conscience of the people, people with authority who have displayed high moral character and wisdom as well as abundant experience in life, would be in keeping with this pattern. However, an indubitable method of selecting such people is by no means apparent.

A Duma comprised of social strata and professions, one might say *estates*, could be a kind of substitute. (According to Dal, the first meaning of this word is: people with a common occupation, having common rights; the second meaning is: condition, class, caste.)

These are the two most natural principles of interaction and cooperation among people: By virtue of the common territory on which they live; and by virtue of their occupation and the emphasis of their activities. All of us have our own work and specialties, and by virtue of these we claim a useful place in the structure of society. An impersonal, complete equality of human expression amounts to entropy and a direction leading to death. A society is alive precisely because of its differentiation. The people who think, work, and create everything by which the country lives carry the burden of the state. The better a nation is organized into social groups, the more clearly its creative forces come to the fore (L. Tikhomirov).

Viable estates, estates not in the sense of castes but by virtue of professions and sectors of application of labor, will undoubtedly arise and rally in our unshackled society as years go by. For too long those who know nothing about business were in control and managed all pursuits. Finally, all pursuits should be engaged in by knowledgeable people. Nobody is able to give better advice in any endeavor than a representative of the given profession. (Estates based on the common spiritual and business creativity of people belonging to the same profession should by no means be confused with *trade unions*. One is a natural member of an estate by virtue of his work alone. Trade unions are organizations for fighting for salaries and material benefits which not everyone joins or is allowed to join.)

Representation by estate could evolve and operate in addition to the zemstvo, territorial representation.

(Some of the energy that is wasted in the parties will be channeled into constructive, estate-based activities.)

The election (nomination) procedure for deputies of every estate to the Assembly Duma would be determined by the estate itself. They would send there the most experienced and worthy ones, those to whom they entrust general judgment related to the kind of activities engaged in by their estate (leading estates will send two representatives each) rather than political deputies for defending their political interests.

In order to make it more convenient to concentrate work, the number of members of the Duma should not exceed 200-250. (There may turn out to be more estates than that, but one representative may be sent by a group of related small estates.)

Expressing an opinion without voting is no novelty at all. For example, the mountaineers of the Caucasus for a long time followed the procedure of "polling the wise men" rather than holding a general election.

Any opinion, judgment, or inquiry which is thoroughly substantiated and addressed to the president, council of ministers, either of the two chambers, or the supreme judicial authority by more than half of the Duma is published. The body that is queried must either accept this judgment for guidance or within two weeks publish the grounds on which the query has been rejected. (In exceptional cases involving military secrets, the exchange does not occur publicly; however, in this case as well the members of the Duma are entitled to obtain any necessary information on the operation of the presidency, the government, the legislature, or the courts.)

A candidate for president may likewise be nominated by more than one-half of the Duma.

If the judgment of the Assembly Duma is adopted **without dissenting votes** it supersedes any law and any action of any establishment. Such a law or action must be changed. By the same token, any presidential candidacy may be vetoed.

Adding a consultative and highly knowledgeable Assembly Duma leaves an intellectual and moral imprint on all branches of power. Opportunities to improve a society by political means alone are not great.

"The goal of communal living is to establish a moral order among the people" (M.M. Speranskiy). "To be stable, freedom and the rule of law must be based on the inner consciousness of the people" (A.K. Tolstoy). "A political fortress is only strong when it is based on moral strength" (V.O. Klyuchevskiy).

The law is a minimum of moral requirements placed on an individual, below which he becomes dangerous to the society. "In many cases something that is a right is prohibited by morality, which applies loftier and more stringent commandments to man" (P.I. Novgorodtsev).

The moral element should be above the legal one. Justice means compliance with the moral right before the legal right.

Let Us Search

In this brief work I have not been able to discuss the Army, the militia, the court system, most of the legislative issues, economics, and the trade unions. My task was merely to offer certain individual considerations which do not claim to be final to any degree, and merely to prepare the ground for discussion.

A reasonable and just structuring of the life of the state is a very difficult task, and it may only be achieved very gradually, through a number of successive approximations, and in a groping manner. This task has not disappeared even for the present-day affluent Western countries. We should look at them too with our eyes wide open rather than in exultation. However, this task is much more painful and acute in our country, when we begin with a catastrophic failure of the country and a population unaccustomed to it.

It is excessively difficult to compile any well-designed work for the future: It is likely to contain more mistakes than virtues, and it will be difficult for it to keep in step with the real course of events. And yet: We must not stop trying altogether.

The thoughts of many Russian figures from various times are the foundation for the work offered to you. I hope that fusing them may spawn fruitful growth.

[Dated] July 1990

(Footnote) (Aleksandr Isayevich Solzhenitsyn donated his honorarium for this publication to benefit the victims of Chernobyl)

Medical Industry Minister Explains Shortages

90US1327A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report on an interview with V.A. Bykov, USSR Minister of Medical Industry, by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Romanyuk: "A Medicine for Shortages"]

[Text] [V. Romanyuk] Valeriy Alekseyevich, let us start with the main thing: Why have medicines disappeared? Is it because we used to buy them like bread and now cannot afford new purchases?

[V.A. Bykov] We always tried to estimate our medicinal requirements on the basis of our budget. And the real needs were being distorted as early as that stage.

[Romanyuk] However, drugs would appear in the pharmacies. But now there are none.

[Bykov] Yes, our shelves are empty and there are several reasons for it. It is true that the supplies from the countries—CEMA members—diminished. By the way, I do not find anything wrong with importing drugs. Not a

single country can do without it today. But every country also has its own sound pharmaceutical industry. But our relations with our partners were structured so that we gave them fuel, metals, and electric power and received small-scale chemistry products, including pharmaceutical products and the equipment for their production. In this way we financed, in a way, the development of the pharmaceutical industry in those countries and did it five times more generously than in our own country. At present we spend 1.5 billion rubles a year to purchase medicines from other countries. And imported drugs cost us five to six times more than it would cost us to produce them at home.

Lately we lived through a number of production halts caused by ecological reasons. They resulted in medicine losses of up to a billion rubles a year. Besides, a curtailment at one plant usually disrupts the work of a long technological chain. At the Kirovograd copper smelting plant, for instance, they halted the production of chlorosulfonic acid, which provides for the needs of half of our country. Immediately the Perm plant started having trouble with the production of benzenesulfonic acid methyl ether for which the acid is used. And the ether is the base for the production of dipyrone [Analgin] and amidopyrine. Here is your reason why Analgin disappeared: Due to the lack of its components production was cut by 70 percent. Analgin, in its turn, is a component in many painkillers.

[Romanyuk] One can always find some objective reasons for anything. But how would you explain the unexpected shortages: Now there are no mustard plasters, now there are no contraceptives?

[Bykov] The Ministry of Medical Industry is only one of the 18 producers of medicines. And it has practically nothing to do with any of the items you have mentioned. Mustard plasters are produced by the Volgograd plant of the State Agroindustrial Committee and it is the only one in the country. Here you see the faults of monopolizing: The smallest hitch in Volgograd leaves the entire country without mustard plasters. As for contraceptives, they are produced by the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry plants. Some of the medicines are produced by the Main Pharmacy Administration ("Soyuzfarmatsiya") of the USSR Ministry of Health which owns pharmaceutical plants. Many of the 30,000 pharmacies have their own "production"—they make ointments, etc. We have raised the issue of concentrating both the production and distribution of medicines in one hand; we are prepared to undertake this entirely ourselves.

[Romanyuk] Maybe you should delegate the pharmaceutical concerns to the republics?

[Bykov] The pharmaceutical industry is getting integrated in the entire world. As a mobilizing industry of the country, it should be an All-Union one.

[Romanyuk] And thus you would monopolize the production?

[Bykov] FRG's Bayer, Sweden's TsBG, United States' Eli Lily considerably exceed our industry in potential. Their branches can be found all over the world and each of them, by the way, has a three to five times bigger potential than our similar plants. Decentralization is appropriate when we deal with producing ready- to-use medicines from substances and solutions—in this case small enterprises can be very efficient.

[Romanyuk] Well, what is being done about the problem of disposable syringes?

[Bykov] This year we will produce a billion disposable syringes and the same number will be made by the Ministry of General Machine Building . At first our needs of them were defined as three billion syringes a year, now they are talking about six billion. To me this does seem to be a panacea. Especially, since quite often disposable syringes are used more than once and this invalidates the whole idea. The problem evidently can be solved by parallel development of both types of syringes and by creating a reserve of individual-use or family-use syringes. Now we produce 30 million multiple-use syringes a year, but we need no less than 50 million. I think we can solve the problem by making it possible for each family to have their own syringe, like a thermometer, for instance; disposable syringes will then be used in extreme situations, by ambulances.

[Romanyuk] Medics are complaining that the supply of medicines deteriorated in the country on general. What has happened?

[Bykov] The situation looks that way because the USSR Ministry of Health revised the requirements some time in the middle of the last five-year period. Actually the production of medicines increased by 40 percent during these five years and supplies to the health care institutions increased almost by 70 percent. It happened at the expense of all other consumers who have their own independent medical service.

[Romanyuk] But there were numerous occasions when pharmacies did not have the medicines, requisitions for which have been met 100 percent. Whatever happens to these medicines?

[Bykov] Recently I got a letter from D. Lukashevich, a pharmacy chemist—inspector of the Lvov association "Farmatsiya." In his letter he reveals very convincingly how they artificially create shortages of most ordinary drugs. For instance, during the inventory the Lvov central pharmaceutical storage facility did not have 900 drugs, requisitions for which have been met in full. What can we say then about the drugs that are really in short supply! Four out of five pharmacies do not have medicines that were supplied to the Lvov oblast in the required amounts; nearly every other pharmacy does not have the obligatory 700 items which make up the required minimum list. Every tenth pharmacy does not have such a simple thing as eye droppers; meanwhile over half a million of them have been sitting in storage facilities. Very often people travel to Moscow from

faraway places to buy those medicines that should be plentiful in their own towns. This problem can be solved. But we need automated processes to research the demand and to define the medicinal needs; we need to set up a network of automated storage facilities with drug distribution programs. I repeat: there should be one master of the entire system.

[Romanyuk] And with this unstable system you are ready to enter the market?

[Bykov] We are not afraid of the market. Even more than that, as you see, we "crave" the role of a general contractor in the production and distribution of drugs. We are not trying to hang on to our ministerial structure either—we are prepared to become a corporation, with 200 personnel compared to the present 600. We have already set up the necessary structures: 12 sectorial concerns and one territorial—in the Ukraine. Each concern is financially autonomous; the complexes close to each other in their production types overlap each other's products by about 20 percent. That was done to prevent extreme monopolization of the production. As we enter the market we are ready to waive the government subsidies, which at present reach R100 million a year. The subsidies only serve to diminish the losses and we want to have our own profits.

[Romanyuk] By raising the drug prices?

[Bykov] We are talking here about eliminating the current imbalances. Drug production is profitable everywhere in the world. Do not forget that this production requires utmost precision. The current situation looks like this: 500 drugs out of 2,500 are unprofitable. To stop operating at a loss we have to increase profitability to 15 to 30 percent. This is not a simple matter given our drug prices. Take validol, for instance. Apart from producing the drug itself, we need to buy aluminum, make it into tubes, finish them, make polymer tops, package the drug and deliver it to 30,000 pharmacies. And for all that the customer pays 12 kopeks. I agree that the drugs should not be expensive. But they should not bring us losses either.

[Romanyuk] Do you think you will be able to cope with such problems within the corporation framework?

[Bykov] We will function according to the right of the owner and manufacturer.

[Romanyuk] How can you marry your desire of ownership with the sovereignty of the republics?

[Bykov] We would like the ownership unite and not to divide the Union. For instance, a Swiss national firm has its offices in Italy, FRG, Brazil, and even in the United States and it does not violate anyone's sovereignty. I repeat that a mobilizing industry cannot be broken into parts. If there is an outbreak of cholera somewhere, do I have to coordinate my actions with the owners in the republics? This may only result in criminal procrastination. As for enterprises, their rights of ownership can be activated through joint stock holding.

[Romanyuk] But joint stock holding is not sufficient to lead the industry out of an obvious crisis.

[Bykov] To develop the pharmaceutical industry we could use the unfinished structures of nuclear power stations or any other halted construction projects. But every time we run into the evidence of nationalistic selfishness. Take the Krasnoyarsk radar station—it is ideal for creating a major medicine producing plant. But we cannot come to terms with the local authorities for anything. Medicine was recognized as one of the top priority industries. Let us give it top priority in reality and not just on paper.

Work of Interagency 'Secrets' Panel Cited

PM2509154790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 90 p 1

[Interview with Doctor of Juridical Sciences V. Pustogarov, department chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, by V. Umnov; place and date not given: "Where Are the 'Stamps' Hiding—Interview With a Man Who Knows Too Much"—first two paragraphs are an editorial introduction]

[Text] An interdepartmental commission on the "Secrets" program was set up at the start of 1988. Specialists from the Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Internal Affairs, KGB, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Prosecutor's Office, Ministry of Justice, Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press, and USSR Academy of Sciences had to sort out our society's holy of holies—the system of protecting secrets.

We were able to meet with one of the participants in this work, Doctor of Juridical Sciences V. Pustogarov, department chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute.

[Umnov] Vladimir Vasilyevich, by agreeing to this interview, are you not afraid of accidentally betraying a secret?

[Pustogarov] I was told that a Japanese company once invited our specialists and showed them advanced technology which, naturally, was a state secret. Our people were astonished: How can it be? And they are answered: It does not matter, you cannot make it....

[Umnov] That sounds very much like the truth.

[Pustogarov] But seriously, the "Secrets" program—we worked on it until the end of 1989—should not have inventoried all our secrets as much as tried to put in order this system which the state needs nonetheless.

Up to now we have regulated this field of activity not by law, but by resolutions and instructions. And as a result there is an enormous number of secrets today.

[Umnov] And when did the secrets become too many?

[Pustogarov] Gradually. Let us take 1926. On the basis of a Soviet of People's Commissars resolution, the following were rendered state secrets: Information of a military nature (about the disposition of units, organization and numerical strength, Armed Forces' equipment and financing, mobilization plans, the disposition and state of the military industry, and military inventions); economic information (the state of currency funds, particularly important discoveries and inventions, and detailed import-export information); individual international agreements and talks; methods of combating espionage and counterrevolution; and state ciphers and the content of enciphered correspondence. Twelve points in all. And then the list just grew and grew.

The administrative edict system that has been created, by trying to "conceal" everything, causes both economic and political harm. It—I am convinced—prevents the genuine secrets from being effectively protected.

[Umnov] What then, in your opinion, should constitute a state secret today?

[Pustogarov] Information whose disclosure could cause serious damage to defense, security, or the state's economic and foreign policy interests. But, on the other hand, if you so desire you can pile up endless economic secrets....

Previously we talked about secrets generally, without subdividing them. But there are personal secrets—and they must also be protected, only by different methods—and professional secrets—a doctor's or an investigator's. Commercial secrets have also appeared in our country. Incidentally, abroad they now pursue them more than state secrets because it is a more profitable business, a business amounting to thefts of new technology.

Here these differences, in contrast to many foreign countries, are practically unregulated in the legal respect.

[Umnov] Stop a moment. Let us imagine that a Union law on state secrets appears. But who guarantees that the same long list will not immediately be "added" to it, this time under the heading of professional, official, and departmental secrets?

[Pustogarov] But that is another question. Naturally, there is a need for liability for the wrongful classification of information as secret—and in many countries it is provided for.

In my view, the law must establish that information whose concealment violates citizens' constitutional and legislative rights, their personal security, damages health, or involves dangerous consequences for the ecological situation cannot constitute a state secret. Nor can information of a personal nature and all official secrets [sluzhebnyye sekrety] be a state secret.

Let us adopt such a directive—and it will become easier to protect state secrets. For instance, protecting official secrets should be made the responsibility of the interested departments.

[Umnov] And how can what is created in these departments be controlled? Neighbors of your institute—the Ministry of Defense—will adopt, for instance, the directive on its own official secrets—but just try and check up....

[Pustogarov] Well, first, we will adhere to the presumption of innocence and not jump the gun with our suspicions. And what is our parliament for? It can summon a minister for a report and set up its own commission for an investigation.

There are also other forms of democratic control. For example, a list of secrets must be published periodically. Otherwise that too remains classified here!

[Umnov] Who makes the decision to classify material?

[Pustogarov] An enormous number of people. It is by no means always ministers, but much lower-ranking staffers.

[Umnov] And somewhere it specifies who obtains such a right?

[Pustogarov] In service instructions.

[Umnov] In each department's own instructions?

[Pustogarov] ...Do you know why I am hard put to answer such questions? Such a labyrinth of instructions has been created that sometimes it is difficult to sort things out.

So you will say, can there be state secrets in the social sciences? In philosophy, juridical science? But every academic institute had its own special department.

As far as I know, previously very likely every paper emanating from the Central Committee, and especially from the Secretariat—not to mention the Politburo—automatically carried a stamp. Moreover, an awe-inspiring one: "Top Secret," "Especially Important"—which would not be a matter for discussion there.

And after all, a regime of secrecy, apart from anything else, costs a lot.

[Umnov] Well, what is the result of the "Secrets" program's work?

[Pustogarov] I can talk only about our part of the work, the legal part. A working group has been set up at the institute which has prepared material for a draft law. The draft has been sent to the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences.

[Umnov] And beyond that?

[Pustogarov] I do not know yet. [Interview ends]

I heard that at the end of the last USSR Supreme Soviet session A. Lukyanov said: There are around 100 draft laws in the Presidium. Between 25 and 30 can be adopted at each session. Just figure it out.

Internal Troops Depoliticization 'Exaggerated'

PM2409132590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 90 p 2

[Report by V. Filin: "Three Months Before Reform"]

[Text] The USSR president's decree on reforming political organs in the USSR Armed Forces and KGB and MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] troops was recently promulgated. How is this taking place in today's "busiest" troops—the Internal Troops? At the Internal Troops Political Administration we were told that in a number of operational motorized infantry units carrying out duties mainly in the "hot" regions of the Transcaucasus political organs were transformed into political apparatuses at the beginning of this year, in the interests of service necessity. This was totally unconnected with the presidential decree. Work on radically reforming the political organs is still at the initial stage. The decree set a three-month deadline for the preparation of a new statute on political organs. The new statute is now being drafted and, as is well known, will be presented for approval by the country's government. Naturally, the new look of the political organs and their functions will depend on the government's future decision. And so the rumors about the disbandment of the political organs in the internal troops have been greatly exaggerated.

Marxist Workers Party Holds Second Congress

PM2509083190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by L. Yudin under the rubric "Party Chronicle": "The Mind Boggles..."]

[Text] The Second Congress of the Marxist Workers Party—the party of the dictatorship of the proletariat—has been held in Moscow. More than 100 delegates from Russia, Armenia, Moldova, Latvia, and Kazakhstan gathered under the slogan "Organize Yourself, Working Class!"

In spite of the mention of the word "dictatorship" in the name of the party, the congress participants consider themselves advocates of democratic change. In the opinion of Marxist Workers Party Member Yu. Leonov, a redistribution of power is taking place at the present time in the country, but not a transfer of power to the people.

Judging by the documents adopted at the congress, the Marxist Workers Party rejects both the transition to the market and a return to bureaucratic administration methods. The party sees the way out of the crisis as lying in establishing worker self-government, in the "proletarian democracy" of a Soviet (as opposed to a parliamentary) state.

An appeal by the party to workers, peasants, and all the working people of the Soviet Union says: "United workers and peasants must and will be able to curb crime, end shortages, and regulate production. For this an initial step must be taken. We call for worker and peasant soviets (committees) to be formed without delay in all enterprises—starting with the team, the section, and the shop."

'Radical-Democratic' Bloc Forming in Moscow

LD2309172590 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1353 GMT 23 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 23 (TANJUG)—A radical-democratic anti-communist bloc will soon be set up in Moscow, as learnt from sources close to radical parties and movements.

The party bloc is expected to be formed in the next two weeks, unhindered by the authorities.

The bloc will probably include the Democratic Party, already established on the federal level, the Christian Democratic party, a faction of the Russian Democratic Party, headed by world chess champion Garry Kasparov, and a radical wing of the Pamyat Association, which opposes anti-Semitism.

The initiators of the idea quote the eradication of communist ideology from social practice through parliamentarian methods as the aim of the bloc.

They believe that the time has come to set up a bloc of radical parties, since the centre bloc (headed by Gorbachev) is consolidating its forces with democratic left-wing movements.

Anti-communist radicals fear that this union could result in the Communist Party forming a government on its own, instead of entering a coalition, as the radicals want.

There are no detailed reports on the number of parties and movements set up in the Soviet Union during the period of "glasnost" and "perestroyka", especially after the multi-party system was legally introduced. Their number in various parts of the country is believed to exceed 2,000.

All-Union Jewish Cultural Association Formed

PM2109105590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 7

[Report by correspondent V. But: "Jewish Cultural Society Formed"]

[Text] The All-Union Association of Judaism and Jewish Culture in the USSR has been founded at a conference in Rostov-na-Donu.

Representatives of 74 Jewish organizations, communities, and scientific and educational establishments from all over the country, as well as foreign scientists and specialists, took part in the conference. The first steps to

be taken by the association after its registration will be to form an Institute of Judaism attached to the USSR Academy of Sciences, develop methods for teaching Jewish history and culture, create national textbooks, open libraries, and restore monuments.

Call for End to GOSR Celebrations Decried

PM2409152190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Open letter from All-Union Council of Veterans of War, Labor, and the USSR Armed Forces and the Soviet War Veterans Committee: "Voicing Veterans' Opinion"]

[Text] The open letter sent by G. Popov and A. Sobchak, chairmen of the Moscow and Leningrad City Soviets, to Russian city soviet presidiums calling for the abandonment of festive demonstrations and rallies on the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution has aroused legitimate protest among veterans of war, labor, and the USSR Armed Forces.

Voicing the opinion and feelings of millions of veterans of war, labor, and the USSR Armed Forces, the all-Union Veterans Council and the Soviet War Veterans Committee roundly condemn the action taken by G. Popov and A. Sobchak. For veterans of the Soviet Union and all the Soviet people and progressive mankind the Great October Socialist Revolution was and remains the most outstanding event of the 20th century and is of world historical significance.

We ask all the working people of the Soviet Union—veterans and young people, workers and kolkhoz [collective farm] members, and our Soviet intelligentsia—not to succumb to the appeals of "solicitous bosses," to celebrate everywhere the 73d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution as our chief festive occasion, and thereby to confirm once again our devotion to the ideals of October and the socialist choice.

[Signed] All-Union Council of Veterans of War, Labor, and the USSR Armed Forces
Soviet War Veterans Committee

Metallurgists Stage Union Congress in Moscow

LD2409222790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 24 September in its "Vremya" newscast carries a two-minute report by correspondent M. Zotov from the 14th Congress of the Metallurgical Industry Workers Union, which opened in Moscow today.

Zotov begins by observing that functionaries of Georgia's Independent Federation of Metallurgists are attending the congress as guests, and that the possibility of a new, independent federation emerging is not being denied. "So that people from the central committee of the present trade uniuon understand that something needs to be changed in order to regain the workers' confidence, it is being proposed to the congress that the charter of a new association called Soyuzmetal and the report of the leader of the current central committee, (Nikolay Kornoukh), be discussed. From his report it is clear that the main task of the congress is to remove social tension in labor collectives."

Zotov interviews Lev Alekseyevich Voronin, deputy chiarman of the USSR Council of Ministers, in a separate room. He asks: "What main demands are the metallurgists making of the government?"

Voronin replies: "First, that by the year 1991 the volumes of financing and execution for social matters should be sufficient and should not be below the level of the year 1990. We will resolve this question. The question of improving material and technical supplies was posed very acutely. We have adopted government decisions under which for many materials and a great deal of equipment we will supply metallurgists in a centralized manner in 1991. The northerners were very worried about the matter of shipping in provisions. Decisions have been made, and today we are confident that we will ship vegetables, vegetables and potatoes to the entire north in sufficient quantities, and now we are taking additional measures for shipping in other produce."

Zotov then interviews A.G. Krylov, chairman of the Yakutzoloto trade union committee, who says that they should be guaranteed as a minimum if not a basic minimum for subsistence, then at least some decent existence. "After all, today we have no potatoes, no onions, no vegetables. Our climate conditions are such that they reduce the lifespan of all of us by 20 years. If we throw away 20 years of our life and have nothing to eat into the bargain, how much will we be losing?"

Collectives' Property Rights To Be Upheld

PM2409110390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by correspondent I. Virabov]

[Text] Tolyatti—At the beginning of September in Tolyatti, without making a particular fuss, the proletariat found a new spokesman for its interests. For now it is called the organizing committee for coordinating the actions of the country's enterprises' labor collective councils and workers committees. In the words of Volga Automobile Plant worker V. Vyacheslav, the proletariat had to unite "not, as in 1917, in order to show its formidable destructive power, but in order to work out together methods of protection against merciless exploitation and the half-starved existence which threatens us in the near future."

The Tolyatti conference's prehistory is as follows: The USSR Law "On Enterprises in the USSR" adopted 4 June provoked a stormy reaction at the Volga Automobile Plant since, in the opinion of the association's labor

collective council, "it harms the interests of state enterprise labor collectives as regards developing self-management, organizing the labor collective council's work, and appointing managers by election." At that point a special working group set off for Leningrad and Moscow and quickly found like-minded people. The conference of labor collective councils' representatives drew participants from 50 of the country's cities. USSR people's deputies came—Travkin, Bocharov, Sulakshin, and Yarin.

At one point in the course of a stormy debate those assembled grasped that it was not worth getting together for the sake of an "exchange of experience." The essentials must be defined. And the essential thing, judging from the adopted document, is that "the master of the enterprise's property is the enterprise's labor collective."

The organizing committee has been elected. An all-Union congress of labor collective councils and workers committees is scheduled for December this year.

Official Discusses State of Soviet Psychiatry

LD2409175290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Interview with M.G. Tseregorodtsev, head of the International Independent Psychiatric Center, by T. Korupayeva; place and date not given]

[Text] [Announcer] At the end of this September an international seminar on the social and legal issues of contemporary psychiatry is to be held in the Czech town of Ceske Budojovice. Psychiatrists from the International Independent Psychiatric Center will be taking part in the seminar. Our correspondent, Tatyana Korupayeva, has interviewed Mikhail Gennadiyevich Tseregorodtsev, head of the center.

[Begin recording] [Tseregorodtsev] The point is that social protection for psychiatric patients still remains a highly topical fact in contemporary Soviet psychiatry. The draft law on the procedures for providing assistance to psychiatrically ill patients does not guarantee Soviet citizens good social, legal and judicial protection. We will discuss this draft law and make fresh amendments. Incidentally, we have brought to the attention of the USR Supreme Soviet our own draft from the center on the procedures for providing psychiatric aid to mental patients which, it seems to us, fully covers this legal and judicial basis.

[Korupayeva] I know that at the start of this October a delegation from the World Psychiatric Association is due to visit our country. What, do you think, is the reason for this visit?

[Tseregorodtsev] The point is that the Soviet Society of Psychiatrists and Narcologists was conditionally readmitted at the Eighth World Psychiatric Congress last October. This delegation from the World Psychiatric Association, the WPA, is coming on a tour of inspection. They will inspect psychiatric institutions in the Soviet Union and clarify whether Soviet psychiatry is being used once again to criminal ends.

Despite the statement by leaders of Soviet psychiatry to the effect that they have mended their ways, many independent organizations, including our own, have a great deal of factual material at their disposal suggesting that the situation has changed little for the better. We receive thousands of letters and hundreds of people come to us, complaining that they are being placed even today in psychiatric hospitals. The conditions for caring for people in psychiatric hospitals are very cruel. This delegation will have to decide whether to leave the Soviet Society of Psychiatrists and Narcologists within the World Psychiatric Association. If facts of new abuses of Soviet psychiatry are confired, a new general assembly of the World Psychiatric Association will be convened immediately, at which the USSR Society of Psychiatrists and Narcologists will be expelled from the world community.

[Korupayeva] SOVETSKAYA TORGOVLYA on 11 September published an address from your center to the public.

[Tseregorodtsev] That is correct, and not only to the public but to all citizens of the Soviet Union. In that address we describe the history of Soviet punitive psychiatry and the state of affairs at present and call upon various public organizations of the Soviet Union and other countries and upon ordinary citizens, to help our center in our humane and noble activity, because a portion of any contributions will be spent purely on charitable aims such as help to victims of psychiatric repression.

Similarly, we will send some of the money to improve the situation of patients in psychiatric hospitals. We will help with food and help in some way to improve the quality of medical provision. It is for this reason that our center for international scientific research into psychiatry has become involved in such mediatory commercial work, and for this reason we should like to invite any organization in the Soviet Union and working collectives already in existence to earn money, under our auspices in advantageous conditions as independent self-financing organizations, to be used subsequently for charitable ends.

I should also like to give the account number: 608-653 Moscow 113162, Shablovskoye Department of the USSR Zhilsotsbank. [end recording]

Moscow Demonstrators Call for Detainee's Release

LD2409224890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2007 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Report by R. Djhafarov from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Announcer Yuriy Rostov] A rally took place in Pushkin Square in Moscow today in defense of Valeriy Novodvorskaya.

[Begin recording] [R. Djhafarov] She has been accused under the article on insulting the honor and worth of the president of the USSR. Those gathered at the rally demanded the immediate release of Valeriya Novodvorskaya. [video shows crowd chanting "Freedom" at rally being addressed by Colonel Nikolay Vladimirovich Proselkov]

[Proselkov] Nikolay Vladimirovich Proselkov, fighter pilot with 33 year's flight experience. At present, a reserve colonel.

[D. Djhafarov] Excuse me, please, what is the reason for holding today's rally?

[Proselkov] Today's rally is in defense of human rights. Today, the Democratic Union—that is a party—is protesting the fact that one of its leaders, Valeriya Novodvoskaya, has been seized. [end recording]

[Rostov] The fact that Novodvorskaya has repeatedly insulted the president in the press and verbally is now considered to be proved.

Papers Likely To Revise Publication Patterns

PM2109104190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Sep 90 First Edition p 4

[Captain Second Rank V. Chupakhin, deputy chief editor of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, answers reader's letter under the heading "Volume of Content Will Stay the Same"—first two paragraphs are a reader's letter]

[Text] "As I understand it, readers can not only expect to pay more for their newspaper in the New Year, but have another surprise waiting for them as well: a reduction in the number of issues published. Does this mean that we are going to have to pay more for less information?"

[Signed] V. Vylegzhanin, Sevastopol

That is not strictly true. Although there is certainly a "surprise" in store—one which, we appreciate, will not be to every reader's liking. The author of this surprise is the USSR Ministry of Communications. Motivated by the need to give postal workers a uniform day off, it has simply told editorial offices and publishing houses that newspapers will not be delivered on Sundays. What is the point of publishing a newspaper that is not going to be able to reach its readers? So it looks as if central newspapers—including our own, alas—are not going to be published on Sundays in 1991.

What is the solution to this? There is no definitive answer at present. But we are studying the option of publishing a double issue on Saturdays. We would keep the traditional supplement but it would come out on Wednesdays instead of Saturdays. This option does have a serious drawback, of course: The familiar structure of readers' information supply would be broken. But every cloud has a silver lining, as the saying goes: A double issue would give greater scope for publishing some very interesting material. Let us not run on ahead, however. These are all just possibilities. But we can assure everyone who wishes to subscribe to the newspaper in 1991 that the volume of content and, consequently, the volume of information will remain the same. Readers will receive 300 issues per year as they have always done.

Economic

Economists Comment on Market Plan Delay

PM2509144190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Unattributed feature under the heading "Transition to the Market: When and How?"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] When will we move toward the market and how? The USSR Supreme Soviet resolution adopted 24 September postpones the answer to those questions until mid-October. The editorial office asked the country's leading economists to comment on the situation that has arisen.

Academician L. Abalkin:

"I regard the decision adopted as yet another attempt to achieve consensus. It is to be hoped that this opportunity has not been missed. Because, without consensus, radical reforms on such a scale as the transition to the market are impossible. I want to stress in particular that there is a minimum number of essential conditions without which no program, whatever is adopted, can be implemented.

"The conditions for the implementation of the program are the attainment of social consensus, which demands not only agreement between sovereign republics (this is important, but is only part of the problem). There are powerful sociopolitical forces and mass social movements of various types. Only by uniting can they ensure the implementation of the programs. The attempt to cause confrontation, division, and opposition to the radical reforms threatens to defeat these reforms and render them unworkable.

"The form in which this consensus will be reached—at a round table or a fundamentally renewed Presidential Council, which will include popular public figures and representatives of truly mass forces with hundreds of thousands even millions of people behind them—is a technical matter. But consensus is the first condition. The second is the restoration of the authority of, and respect for the law. A state in which the law loses authority in the eyes of the citizens will inevitably slide into chaos and the deep chasm of disorder and tremendous social upheavals. An equally important condition is agreement among everyone to form a kind of civil peace and declare a moratorium on the adoption of decisions

and on sociopolitcal actions which could destabilize the situation. There are also purely economic prerequisites: the preservation of economic links (although conserving them is not ideal, it is necessary factor in stabilization); the cessation of such insane actions as the economic blockade of regions and strong-arm pressure, including using the strike movement and the closure of enterprises, is of vital importance to the country.

"And finally one more issue. The differences between the programs are quite considerable. They are not the result of whim or political or academic ambitions. They are simply different views, a different assessment of the actual situation. Here the problem of political choice arises. It is necessary to listen to all the arguments and adopt a decision. The president, as organizer of this work, cannot belong to any of the 'teams.' He must stand above them all—above the government, above Yeltsin, above Shatalin and Abalkin, because he has the final word. And correspondingly he must form 'teams' of those people who will be his colleagues, sharing with them all the glory in the event of success, all the responsibility in the event of failure."

Academician A. Aganbegyan:

"The two documents can be combined in further work only if the program drawn up by academician Shatalin's group forms the basis. The basic concept must be taken from there. The principal sections, for example, the section on price formation, must be taken from there.

"But that does not mean at all that there are no standpoints in the government program that could not also form part of the final document. Painstaking work lies ahead. And it seems to me extremely important that it be coordinated with representatives of union republics. In particular with B. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, and I. Silayev, head of the Russian government.

"It is a pity, of course, that the adoption of the final decision is again being postponed for a while. But there will be no great calamity here if we start right now taking certain steps to transfer to the market. After all, both programs contain quite a few common or similar points. Take, for example, the increasing of interest rates on loans and certain other features bound up with financial and credit policy.

"In short, both programs have quite a few points of contact. And now, in my opinion, we should act rather than sit around waiting for the final draft."

N. Petrakov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences:

"The decision is in keeping with the rather strange nature of the discussion of the two programs by the Supreme Soviet. I recall that all the deputies' attention was focused purely on the program drawn up by Academician S. Shatalin's group. Its advantages and disadvantages were hotly debated, while the government plan was essentially overshadowed. We must assume that in days to come it will be analyzed.

"It turned out that the two programs 'ended up' on 'equal terms,' as it were. Yet the government plan is just a reworking of the concept that our parliament had previously rejected. It sets the same store by a one-shot price hike on 1 January 1991, only to a somewhat lesser extent—by 'just' 135 billion rubles [R] instead of R199 billion. And it is now planned to compensate the population 100 percent. Additionally, 30 percent of prices will be allowed to float [perekhodyat v zonu svobodnogo tsenoobrazovaniya].

"Now let us think. Where will this R135 billion for compensation come from? From the printing presses, naturally. Given the current speed of ruble circulation it would be necessary to immediately issue around R30-32 billion—pieces of paper not backed up by any goods! The money supply would immediately be increased by one-third. Is this in keeping with the USSR Supreme Soviet's decision to restrict the issuance of money in 1990 to R10 billion?

"And note that the government has already used the printing presses in the course of its previous decisions. Purchase prices of grain have been increased—that represents R9 billion—and the early redemption of old bonds accounts for another R6 billion. The intentions in both cases seemed noble. However, are they in keeping with the forthcoming transition to the market? And now there is this new blow to our financial management, which is highly disorganized as it is.

"The only possible result is uncontrolled price growth, primarily as the result of the 30 percent of prices that the government plans to make free-floating! Is not the idea behind this to 'skim off the froth' at the population's expense?

"As is well known, the presidential program provides an entirely different and directly opposite philosophy. Not a flood of inflationary bills, but tight control over the money supply, a clampdown on issuance, and the strengthening of the ruble in every possible way. Can we really arrive at the market by way of inflation?

"Unfortunately, our parliamentarians placed the two plans on a par, and left the responsibility for the ultimate choice to the country's president."

Academician S. Shatalin:

"I remain convinced that the transition to the market is less risky for the country than the penalty that we result from standing still. And it is dangerous now to waste time combining programs that are known to be incompatible. They simply have different blood groups: In the goverment program one can see camouflage for the

administrative system under the market flag; we, however, have set out the general rules for premarket behavior under conditions of a union of sovereign states.

"Administrative regulation of prices is basically futile and under present circumstances it is fatal. It is professionally unethical to persuade people that by raising prices the government will be able to control them and provide fair compensation. In fact, this fails to take into account the real prices of both the shadow economy and the free market. You will immediately get a price explosion in these spheres—how do you compensate for that? Print money, spur on inflation? And how is the government in Moscow to know how much meat Mr. Petrov in Ulyanovsk eats and how much he is supposed to be paid? So you get leveling again. These questions are numerous.

"As is known, our group proposed that the financial and monetary situation should first be stabilized and only then should prices be gradually 'freed.' This would begin to create conditions in which all markets could compete and would begin to accustom them to fighting for consumers and not leading a separate existence from the consumer.

"The approaches to land ownership are incompatible concepts. We are proposing the introduction of all its forms, including private, and we are saying that we are imposing nothing on anyone, that we are giving people the opportunity to choose the forms that are most effective in the given locality. After all, conditions and traditions are different everywhere. You cannot compare the lands of the Kuban and of Uzbekistan. This is a way of acknowledging the peoples' sovereign right to choose for themselves. This right cannot be abolished, just as you cannot abolish sunrise and sunset, while economic laws are eternal as well and they must be respected. Of course, what we are therefore talking about is a new type of political and economic organization for our Union. The government has a different view. And I am in fundamental disagreement with it."

French Firm Signs Oil Development Agreement

LD2609015190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1721 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Yemelyanov]

[Text] Paris, 25 Sep (TASS)—An agreement on cooperation between the major company Elf Aquitaine and a Soviet consortium for trade and economic cooperation with France was signed here today. In accordance with the agreement, which is a concrete contribution towards implementing the agreement on prospecting for and extracting oil on the territory of the USSR signed in May this year between Elf Aquitaine and Soviet organizations, the Soviet consortium will provide assistance to the trade and industrial activities of the French company in our country.

On the French side, the agreement was signed by Loique Floc-Prijean president and director-general of Elf Aquitaine; on the Soviet side, it was signed by S.S. Vinogradov, chairman of the consortium board.

The sides agreed, specifically, that Elf Aquitaine's interaction with Soviet organizations in the field of hydrocarbons, chemicals, pharmaceuticals, and biotechnology should draw other French companies into bilateral business cooperation between the two countries with a view to their participating in developing the Soviet economy in its priority areas.

Loique Floc-Prijean will shortly be making a business trip to the USSR to discuss specific matters connected with implementing the agreement signed this spring.

Military

More Details of Troop Movements Near Moscow

PM2509214990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 90 p 1

[Article by A. Pankratov under the rubric "Returning to What Was Printed": "And Someone Thought Exercises Were Under Way..."]

[Text] I will remind you that the day before yesterday, People's Deputy S. Belozertsev asked a question at the USSR Supreme Soviet concerning "'strange' movements of military subunits" near Moscow. S. Belozertsev declined to name the source of his information, referring to information received from the "Shchit" Union. However, a witness to the alarming events turned up the very next day. Colonel Sergey Kudinov, a participant in the war in Afghanistan, deputy of Ryazan Oblast Council, and chief (now former chief, it seems) of the Ryazan Higher Airborne Command School Political Department, yesterday addressed a meeting of the "Democratic Russia" deputies' group.

In S. Kudinov's opinion, the events developed as follows. As early as 6 September Ryazan Oblast CPSU Committee Bureau had discussed the question of KGB organs' having supposedly intercepted information that democratic forces under the auspices of the Russian government were preparing a plan for the armed seizure of power, television, radio, railroad stations, airports, bridges, and so on. Combat groups of 50 men each had even supposedly been created.

On 9 September the Ryazan Paratroop Regiment and units of the Tula Division were put on the alert, received ammunition and hardware, and were put in a state of combat readiness with unexpected haste (according to S. Kudinov, a parade group was to have left for Moscow 22 September—the railcars had been ordered for that day).

And at 0300 on 10 September, crushing a peaceful Zhiguli in their path (incidentally, this adventure resulted in four casualties—an officer born in 1952, two ensigns, and a soldier who was born in the west Ukraine died as a result of fatigue, disorganization, and muddle), the units moved off.

The school's officers also thought at first that ordinary preparations were under way—maybe for a parade or exercises.... However, units of the Pskov Airborne Division headed by Officer Kozlov began landing at the airfield at 1600 on 10 September.

The Russian government proved not to be in the know. Then USSR People's Deputy N. Molotkov drove to the airfield, and six other deputies dispersed to various military units. None of them was allowed access to the personnel. Either there was no information at all or it was totally inadequate. It was necessary to sound the alarm.

After this, the next morning, the Pskov Division flew off urgently to new stationing locations (it has now returned).

The Ryazan Regiment is now in the region of the "Polezhayevskaya" subway station and has been given a new assignment—to prepare for a parade, but, according to the colonel's information, ammunition has not yet been handed over. The units of the Vitebsk Airborne Division of the USSR KGB Border Troops, which were placed in a state of combat readiness and went toward Moscow, have also been returned. The Dzerzhinskiy Division of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] was also placed in a state of combat readiness.

This was how events developed on the eve of the rally in Moscow announced for 16 September. According to Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic People's Deputy V. Ryumin, a company of airborne assault troopers from Moscow Oblast was even present at the rally itself, dressed in civilian clothes.

"What was this?" Col. Kudinov asked at the end of his speech. "A military-political provocation?" It is necessary to investigate seriously and all together. For, despite everything, the Army nonetheless marched "on Moscow." However, servicemen were concerned. Anxiety and tension reigned within the walls of Ryazan School, for example. The cadets did not believe that the transported division had been flown in, in bulletproof vests and steel helmets and with combat hardware, just to harvest potatoes.

Col. S. Kudinov proposed urgently including a section on the Army in the "500 days" program. For new laws and authentic information get through with difficulty or, more frequently, do not get through to the personnel at all—alas, the machinery for suppressing freedom of thought and dissidence still operates faultlessly. Kudinov knows this from his own rich experience as a political worker who devoted 25 years to the Army.

USSR People's Deputy Sergey Belozertsev also addressed the meeting of "Democratic Russia."

He declared that he had been ready yesterday to submit for examination by the country's Supreme Soviet tape recordings of testimonies by Soviet Army officers on the September troop movements around Moscow, but he was not given the floor. S. Belozertsev also emphasized that practically all the information reported by him in his deputy's question had documentary confirmation.

...You will recall how tension seemed to be stoked last spring, on the eve of the democratic rallies in Moscow. Why can the Law on the Deputy's Status still be calmly violated and why are they, the people's elected representatives, forced against their will to be detectives? How come people in Russia's government and Supreme Soviet really did not know about such large-scale troop movements? And why was the "operation" coordinated so well by the Ministry of Defense, the MVD, and the USSR KGB?

There are more than enough questions to make not only our parliamentarians, but all of us, ponder: But who, nonetheless, issued the order to take measures, and was this with intent, out of fear, or in the course of a dangerous political game?

The more quickly we answer this question, the more comfortably we will sleep.

Parliamentarians Warned of Moscow Troop Buildup

AU2509110390 Paris AFP in English
1049 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 25 (AFP)—Members of the radical Russian Federation parliament were warned Tuesday that several Army divisions and a paratroop regiment, well armed and "ready for action" have been deployed round Moscow in readiness for a "special operation." The warning came from Colonel Sergey Kudinov, former deputy commander of the Ryazan Military Academy in central Russia, who was sacked 10 days ago following publication of a report on the deteriorating situation in the Soviet Army.

Col. Kudinov told a parliamentary committee of about 100 MPs that a paratroop regiment from Ryazan had been moved to Moscow "ready for battle". He said the men had been "specially trained and equipped with bullet-proof jackets."

"A group of about 20 officers in Ryazan has been set up to direct the operation round the clock," he said. The troops began arriving in the Moscow region "on September 9 or 10" according to Col. Kudinov who said four Army divisions had been stationed in the Moscow region since that date.

Col. Kudonov said members of the Russian parliament and the federal Supreme Soviet had vainly tried to contact the troops to find out what was going on.

On Monday, a radical member of the Soviet parliament, Sergey Belozertsev called on the government to explain what the troops were doing. President Mikhail Gorbachev brushed off the question asking Mr. Belozertsev to "name" his informers.

KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov then told parliament that two divisions had effectively been brought to Moscow: a KGB division from Vitebsk, whose normal task was guarding the frontiers of the Caucasus and Moldavia. The men had been moved to Moscow to take part in harvesting operations. The other was the Ryazan paratroop regiment come to take part in the November 7 parade on Red Square, he said.

Colonel Kudinov said the troops were "certainly making ready for November 7 but have battlefield equipment in their hands." He said he was ready to testify to the federal parliament and in the meantime had given additional information to Mr. Belozertsev who would revive the issue in parliament.

Lieutenant General Rejects Coup Speculation

AU2509143690 Zagreb DANAS in Serbo-Croatian 18 Sep 90 pp 56,57

["Exclusive" interview with Lieutenant General Boris Gromov, commander of the Kiev Military District, by Miroslav Lazanski; place and date not given: "A Military Coup Is Out of the Question"]

[Text] [Lazanski] Comrade General, how is perestroyka doing in the units of the Kiev Military District, is there any resistance, are there any problems?

[Gromov] I would like to stress that all members of the Kiev Military District's units, commands, and institutions are greatly interested in the success of perestroyka. In fact, since you mentioned perestroyka and glasnost, we in the Soviet Army had glasnost first, because we were the first to point out problems not only in the Army but also in society. The Kiev Military District's contribution to perestroyka is multifaceted. We are trying to develop as professional attitudes toward work as we can. We have good relations with the population. We helped considerably in dealing with the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster and the earthquake in Armenia. I would particularly like to stress the good relations with the local organs of authority and people, something that is not easy to achieve in the presently complicated times. All our future tasks are also connected with perestroyka.

[Lazanski] You mentioned professional attitudes to work. Does this mean that you are a proponent of a completely professional army in the Soviet Union.

[Gromov] You see, I think that it is too early to talk about a completely professional army of the USSR, because such an army would be very expensive. This is being considered, but I think that reforms in the Armed Forces should be directed toward units which would be more professional and effective, and better equipped. In addition to this, the system of manpower acquisition is closely related to the geostrategic position, the degree of economic development, the financial resources of the country, the real scope of the defense tasks that are put before the country, the number of potential recruits.... It is not accidental at all that the majority of modern armies today use a mixed manpower acquisition system which assumes both general military service and volunteers. This is the most economic and the most effective system of ensuring a sufficient level of combat readiness and manpower available for mobilization. This is the principle we follow today to man our armed forces. About one third of the Army consists of members-volunteers, or professionals. They are in the key posts with regard to combat readiness.

[Lazanski] Assuming that military reform is in the same package with perestroyka, what is the connection between the two and what does the pace of military reform depend on?

[Gromov] Let me say right from the start that military reform is part of perestroyka, one of the constituent parts of the process of reconstructing our society. The aim of military reform is to ensure great efficiency of the defense mechanism with the minimum necessary means and resources. This is why we are using the doctrine of reasonable sufficiency. As regards the pace of military reform, I can say that reforms must be planned and carried out in such a way that they do not affect the armed forces and their defense capability and combat readiness. Of course, there are many factors at play: socioeconomic instability, crises in international relations, the conversion of the military industry, the military-political reality in the world.... We will probably need nine or 10 years to fully carry out all reforms.

[Lazanski] The Soviet Army is now significantly reducing the number of its members. Will this process continue in the future? Will you reduce it even more?

[Gromov] No, why should we continue reducing the number of member of our Army. Why do the armies of the United States and Great Britain not do the same? World peace is not achieved by reducing only the number of soldiers. After all, the West is not in any hurry to abandon certain stereotypes and dogmas from "the cold war period." The military build up of the United States and NATO continues according to the scenario of nuclear deterrent, direct confrontation, and "flexible response."

[Lazanski] Do you have any concrete information to back your view?

[Gromov] I do not think that the reduction of arms and the number of soldiers should be unilateral. The West should also cut down its military might. Unfortunately, there are still some circles in the United States that talk about a military threat from the Soviet Union. In practice, too, one can notice that all major military programs of the West, programs that were adopted earlier, are still being fully carried out. Consider for example the statements by President Bush and the defense minister of the United States during the launch of a new U.S. nuclear submarine. I do not understand why Bush spoke in the way he did. The responsibility for the fate of the country demands of us soldiers that we objectively consider all

factors in carrying out our own military reform and transforming our Armed Forces.

[Lazanski] Is there a danger of a military coup in the Soviet Union. The West is continuously talking about a possibility of Bonapartism in the USSR.

[Gromov] No, there is no chance of that. We will always carry out the orders of the president of the state and the Supreme Soviet.

[Lazanski] What if politicians make a decision that the military establishment considers to be against the interests of the country? What would you do then?

[Gromov] We are not interested in politicians. As I have already said, the president and the Supreme Soviet issues orders. I hope that they will never make a decision that would be against the interests of the defense and security of the country.

[Lazanski] What do you think about a multiparty system and the role of the Communist Party in the Army?

[Gromov] We must wait and see what is going to happen. I am against a multiparty system in the Army. There is no multiparty system in our Armed Forces.

[Lazanski] But the Soviet Communist Party is renouncing its monopoly on power; the multiparty system has practically entered into our laws. The Communist Party no longer has the leading role.

[Gromov] One should wait a little bit longer; we need the entire society to consolidate itself, not only the Communists. You know, 98 percent of the officer cadre is in the Communist Party. More time is needed....

[Lazanski] What about Eastern Europe and the regimes there?

[Gromov] Who says that they were communists, real communists?

[Lazanski] Could you say briefly when the depoliticization of the Soviet Army will take place?

[Gromov] When the armies of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France and other countries depoliticize themselves.

[Lazanski] All right, when will the departyization [departizacija] of the Soviet Armed Forces take place?

[Gromov] Political or ideological institutions exist in all armies in the world in one form or another. In the U.S. Army there is a special system of moral-political education aimed at shaping the moral spirit and personality of the military personnel, and nobody questions the necessity of this system. I think that similar work must be performed in our Army too. The job should be entrusted to political organs as the most important instruments for strengthening the moral-political state of people, military discipline, and the legal system. It is too early to abolish such a practice, to say the least. It is of course another matter that this kind of activity requires a radical perestroyka, that it is necessary to establish a combat and mobilizational spirit. However, if you are asking whether the Communist Party's existence in the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union is drawing to an end, I cannot give a precise answer at present. The Supreme Soviet is discussing this matter, but we do not have a federal law on it yet. There is no law that would regulate the survival of the party, or at least not in the Armed Forces. I cannot say anything else about this at present.

[Lazanski] In your view, do some Soviet republics that have proclaimed independence pose a danger to the Armed Forces? The Ukraine has proclaimed its independence and some requests are already being made that the Ukrainians should serve the Army in their own republic.

[Gromov] In my view the republics that have proclaimed independence do not pose a danger to the Army. I do not think that there is any great danger. We are stationed here in the Ukraine and have everyone's understanding. We are doing our best to help the people to resolve their problems. As much as we can, of course. We do not feel any threat.

[Lazanski] What is your view about national armies—that is, the republican armies in the Soviet Union?

[Gromov] A modern army requires experts of a profile which is not possible or justifiable to shape within the borders of only one republic. Of course, this is only one aspect of the question, the purely military aspect. The creation of national formations is not acceptable in our country for, above all, social-political reasons. Military service in such units is not in accord with the principles of social justice and the equality of all citizens before the law. One cannot allow the burden of service in the harsh conditions of the extreme north, in high altitudes, on the borders, or in the Navy to be borne by only one nation. Besides, considering that our country is experiencing a deterioration in interethnic relations, the switchover to the pure national units would have disastrous consequences. In short, the formation of national republican armies is a step back from the military point of view. This step could dangerously reduce our military strength and the defense capability of the country as a whole. From the economic and technical point of view, it is a delusion, a simple delusion. I think that the reasons are known. From the political point of view, this is a prelude to a fratricidal war.

[Lazanski] Is the leadership of the Soviet Armed Forces unanimous on all these issues?

[Gromov] There are no disputes about these problems. The leadership of the Soviet Army is completely unanimous.

[Lazanski] Will the Soviet Union send its troops to the Gulf. Will there be a joint military action of the United States and the USSR in resolving Iraq's annexation of Kuwait?

[Gromov] You should put this question to our defense minister, Marshall Yazov, and the U.S. secretary for foreign relations Baker, and our Shevardnadze....

Baltic Republics

Coverage of Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Sessions

25 Sep Agenda

LD2509174790

Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1005 GMT on 25 September resumes its live relay of proceedings at a Lithuanian Supreme Council session held in Vilnius. The relay is unmonitorable until 1407 GMT, at which time deputies are heard discussing a draft law on state enterprises. This is following by Industry Minister Rimvydas Jasinavicius explaining some points in the taxation system for state enterprises.

At 1411 GMT reception deteriorates. Deputies put questions to Jasinavicius.

At 1420 GMT debate on the proposed date for adoption of the draft law begins.

At 1425 GMT individual articles of the draft law are debated. The deputies votes on individual amendments and articles.

At 1430 GMT the deputies vote that all enterprises should register by 1 November 1990.

At 1431 GMT the debate continues. Deputy Antanavicius objects to the adoption of the draft law on behalf of the center faction.

At 1436 GMT the whole draft law is put to vote. It is adopted by a majority.

At 1440 GMT Deputy Jarasiunas submits amendments to the draft law on political parties.

At 1452 GMT questions and proposals are put on amendments.

At 1500 GMT debate continues on political party and organization proposals.

At 1510 GMT a vote is taken on alternative proposal on paragraph 3 concerning the number of signatures required to establish a party. A proposal is made to recognize both systems of membership requirements, and is put to vote. A vote is taken on certain membership number requirements for the establishment of a party. The proposals include a 500- or 300-member minimum requirement.

At 1525 GMT a proposal on a 40-member minimum is made and is put to vote. Reception deteriorates to unmonitorable.

At 1535 GMT reception improves. Voting on proposals is in progress. A deputy raises the question of teachers' political rights. Discussion ensues.

At 1545 GMT Deputy Rupeika and others note that political parties must not be active in schools. The depoliticalization of schools is proposed. An amendment—on teachers of general education being prohibited from belonging to political parties—is voted on.

At 1600 GMT debate continues on limitations of party member activity. Reception deteriorates.

At 1605 GMT reception improves. Debate and voting on party member limitation amendments continue. Political party property proposals are voted on. A deputy count is taken: 83 deputies are present; a quorum is achieved.

At 1615 GMT a vote is taken on the entire proposal on the law on political parties in Lithuania. A proposal is made to require new party registration; this is approved by majority vote.

Discussion of future agenda items then follows.

At 1630 GMT the session concludes its proceedings. The session will resume at 0600 GMT on Thursday, 27 September.

Landsbergis Addresses Session

LD2509124990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0732 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report by Lithuanian President Vytautus Landsbergis to the Lithuanian Supreme Council, in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] Esteemed colleagues: I would like to say a few words both about our issues in the wide, international context and about our issues here at home, sometimes considered a very small town in the grand scheme of things.

Currently, changes on a large scale are taking place not only in the USSR but also in Central Europe; therefore we, as a part of those changes in the northeast, want and hope to return to the community of democratic and free states.

Most political forces and states that support us in principle, and in many cases in practical terms in the political sphere and other spheres too, believe that the main decision should be made in Moscow or somewhere between Vilnius and Moscow. This is probably so. Therefore, we can only remind that it would be most right that this issue should not be left for us alone to solve and that the opinions of the world and democratic countries should also be active and meaningful. One way or another, while getting ready, waiting for, and expecting negotiations with the Soviet Union, now again we have a sign of hope.

A more concrete Kremlin step may be taken in this direction, and in so doing will show that it will not confine itself to verbal persuasion only as the case has been until now, to sign one or another legal treaty, namely to join the Soviet Union.

The Supreme Council Presidium believes that a very clear position is needed on both political points and

consolidation of political forces. Therefore, the Presidium proposed to the government to issue a joint statement saying not only that Lithuania is unable to sign any all-Union treaties but also that Lithuania cannot go into any long-term or practically-unlimited-period-of-time economic treaties while political issues are not resolved. We hope the government will support such a joint statement and then probably we will deal with it the day after tomorrow.

When we look at the events, German unification has moved to first place. Various comments were heard not only about the future agreement between the Soviet Union and Germany that has appeared in the press and has only been (?signed) by the USSR and Germany. Some moments in it probably could be interpreted in various ways; however, we should not rush to one-sided and negative interpretations as some hurriedly saw it that way, even our neighbors. We can also give it a rational and just interpretation as we are hoping for just solutions to our questions. We should also think of others as being guided by goodwill.

It looks as if by 3 October, when the final agreement on German unification will be signed in the background of festivities in Berlin on the occasion of German unification, we will probably state our final opinion and our position.

One issue can be seen in this agreement that probably is beneficial and needed by the central leadership of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union attempts to present itself as a Union of states, yet the point that it is a single state is very strongly stressed as if it still remained the same unitarian state as before and not as some 12 states as it should be regarded at present, not as one nation. The issue here may only be a matter of linguistics and terminology.

To tell the truth, although we are dealing individually with the republics of the Soviet Union as we would with states, almost with all 12 of them, we expect negotiations with the central government which still represents a certain entity.

Clearly sooner or later, easily or not so easily, our objective will be reached, probably with greater difficulty rather than not.

We are certain both political and propaganda activities will occur on a large scale before the negotiations both here, in Lithuania, and in the West which I especially would like to speak on and discuss.

More than one article has appeared in the Western press, some very concentrated and very biased, that intimidate the Western public by implying the return of East Europe to Europe, and even more so the transformation of the Soviet Union into independent states, would be detrimental and even dangerous. Readers are coaxed into believing these new states—and in our case the reinstated, restored states that had been under the rule of the Soviet Union—either would be undemocratic or would be violating human rights. Therefore these states are portrayed as not worthwhile in terms of supporting and accepting them into Europe, and as being dangerous to Europe and the whole world. We can read that allegedly we will have 15 nuclear states that will start threatening each other with nuclear warheads. We find it funny that this is presented in full seriousness, and the fact that some republics of the Soviet Union or the Baltic states, which are in the process of becoming free, are planning to set up the defense of their countries becomes a point for certain intmidation.

Of course the fact that East Europe is in need and will need help can be interpreted so that this help should not be needed: Let them continue living in poverty, or it would be better to hold negotiations about help with a single state rather than with many states. It is also better when international organizations are represented by one foreign minister rather than 15 new foreign ministers. Some people think that this would be better because these people do not think much of the rights of nations, and of course they are speaking from the position vividly described by our fold who say: He that is full, believeth not the fasting.

Certain public self-flaggelation—saying our customs or something are not polite or democratic enough or defending provincial political squabbles—may also serve some evil purpose as these may be presented to both our and our region's detriment. Although this may be regarded as happening within our own circles, everything can be made public.

For the West's part, we have noticed more often that their behavior is more important than what they say.

We have our chosen path and we are not going to abandon it. Our path is a peaceful one, and we should not allow it to be distorted by any seemingness or apparantness; in other words, we must continue resisting any provocations that could lead us to strife, and this is what we have been doing over the last two to three years.

Of course, one can get tired. Sometimes the question arises: Are we not getting tired of it [words indistinct] attempts and intimidation that a territory will be taken away from Lithuania. We have seen and we have read about state flags being destroyed in Lithuania. Seeing the destruction of monuments dear to our hearts, we sometimes take an oversimplified attitude to the fact that monuments that are unacceptable to us were defaced or dismantled. When the decision is taken to dismantle unacceptable and obsolete monuments, the servicemen arrive to protect them while carrying out the orders of the old guard. Here confrontations should be avoided because we have to act differently: to educate and explain what factual merits this or that activist has and why it has been decided to remove the monument to them.

I cannot help mentioning a minor incident, which could be regarded as a minor local case, that reflects a certain tension and probably a certain weariness that arose. This

was the case when those who wanted to test our movement succeeded in receiving a rather negative reaction from the Lithuanian public. I speak of local people living around Traku Voke School.

As far as my information goes, I must say that the Lithuanian teacher who lost his cool cannot be praised for this. Children who were taken to this school are not to blame; apologies should be made to the parents. Somehow the explanation given by the culture ministry lacks regrets for what happened.

Of course, we cannot support those seeking strife who know that a squabble will take place and yet go for it, even pushing their children in front of them so that the conflict looks as ugly as possible. [passage omitted]

Thanks to Lithuanian rebirth, the rebirth of national minorities in Lithuania started and is still continuing. [passage omitted]

We would like to appeal to the UN Human Rights Commission so that if it finds it necessary and possible an authorized group or commission could be sent to Lithuania which would get acquainted what problems we have here in Lithuania and how these problems are being solved. Their advice and conclusions would be important to us. [passage omitted]

I hope you will support this letter to the UN Human Rights Commission so that it could be sent to the given address tomorrow in the pocket of one of our ministers. [passage omitted]

Plans to Resettle Soviet Germans

LD2509184190 Warsaw PAP in English 1756 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Vilnius, Sept. 25—The following are excerpts of an interview granted to PAP by Chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Vytautas Landsbergis:

"The leadership of the Soviet Union should assume an attitude of understanding and good will towards the implementation of our independence. We would like its state presence to withdraw in a short period of time or step by step. The USSR Government, which will undertake this task, will be highly valued by us and will earn a good reputation in Lithuania. I will not elaborate on concrete changes. I am of the opinion that we should not interfere in the affairs of another state."

Asked whether he is afraid of the idea to resettle German-Soviet citizens, to the Kaliningrad region, Landsbergis replied:

"As far as I know, there is much more gossip about this issue than there is real action, espcially that those most interested, that is Soviet Germans, did not express their stand. I have never heard about the fate that that community expressed its will for such a solution. I am only aware of their demand to return to the Volga region, to territories from which they have been removed, or a further going postulate: A consent for their resettlement to Germany.

"I have talked, among others, with several representatives of Germans from Kazakhstan, and I state that that idea is some kind of a manoeuvre on the part of Soviet authorities. They want to decide for the German community about where it will be better off."

UN Advice on Minorities Requested

LD2509213190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1435 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By ELTA-TASS correspondent Arturas Mankyavichus]

[Text] Vilnius, 25 September (TASS)—The Supreme Council of Lithuania today adopted an appeal to the UN Human Rights Commission. It contains a request to send a special commission to investigate the legal situation of the Russians, Poles, Belorussians, Jews, and representatives of other national minorities resident in Lithuania.

The Lithuanian Republic is striving to re-establish its democratic institutions and normal relations between the citizen and the state, the document says. An important place here is occupied by the problem of the national minorities which Lithuania has inherited from its past.

It is anticipated that the UN commission will give an objective appraisal of the national differences in the republic and will draw the appropriate conclusions and assist with consultations and advice.

Political Party Law Adopted

LD2509230290 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Today the Supreme Council adopted a political party law. This constitutes one of the most important recent documents in Lithuania's political life.

According to this law, only Lithuanian citizens may become members of political parties in Lithuania. Political parties of other states may not be active or be established in Lithuania. It is a known fact that only one party belonging to another state is currently active in Lithuania—the Soviet Union's Communist Party.

According to the law those serving in internal affairs, state defense, security, courts, procuracy, investigative organs, and other judicial institution positions, as well as diplomatic service representatives, may not be political party members.

Lithuanian Official Comments on Nishanov Report

LD2609101290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Debates on the famous draft law on the Union treaty have begun at the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow. Although Lithuania's position on the issue is clear and unambiguous—Lithuania will not participate in this treaty—the position of the opposite side of is also of interest. This has been partly voiced by R. Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities, when presenting the draft law on the Union treaty. And here is Egidijus Bickauskas, representative of the Lithuanian government in Moscow, commenting on this position concerning the issue of the Baltic states:

[Begin Bickauskas recording] I think attention should be paid to yesterday's report on the Union treaty by R. Nishanov and the fact which is not typical of R. Nishanov, as far as I know him, that he singled out and mentioned the three Baltic republics, saying they did not participate in preparing the Union treaty and are not participating now.

I would say that this should be given careful consideration. However, I could even say that of course it was not on his own initiative because Nishanov is not the sort of person who has his own initiative; that Nishanov started preparing both the Supreme Soviet and the people of Russia, the people of the Soviet Union, for the fact that a different kind of attitude to the Baltic states will have to be adopted; that this is a completely separate issue and that perhaps these states will not take part in signing the union treaty.

If my opinion is confirmed, these then are carefully planned steps. And as I said, the fact that Nishanov is not the kind of person to show his initiative indicates that such decision could be made in the highest levels of the Soviet Union. [end recording]

Lithuanian Official Views Alternate Army Call-Up

LD2609013490 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Audrius Butkevicius, chief of Lithuania's Department for State Protection, has stated in a LIETUVOS RYTAS daily newspaper interview that certain units will begin forming by this fall in which those young men not wishing to serve in the Soviet Army may serve.

"We are totally prepared to begin call-up. We have uniforms, buildings, and other everyday services. However," said Audrius Butkevicius, "whether this can be actually implemented will depend upon the political situation."

The chief of the State Protection Department also stated that to date not a single Lithuanian youth who refused to serve in the Soviet Army has had criminal charges brought against him.

'Leftist Faction' Established in Lithuanian Parliament

LD2509230790 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] One more faction, the Leftist Faction, has been established within the Lithuanian Parliament. This constitutes a fourth parliamentary group already.

The Leftist Faction assembles leftist Communists including well-known Lithuanian Communist Party activists Vladimiras Beriozovas, Justas Paleckis, Mindaugas Stakvilevicius, Coslovas Jursenas—a total of ten members.

A total of 30 Communists are to be found among Lithuanian Supreme Council Deputies. Some of their number belong to the Liberal Democrats' Group while some of them are free [unaffilliated] as yet.

The Leftist Faction announces as its principal goal the aspiration of adopting laws legalizing democracy, [words indistinct], and civil harmony. This faction reflects the direction of the Lithuanian Communist Party's restructuring. It declares itself for implementation of sociodemocratic statutes.

This appears in the declaration on the group's establishment.

European Parliament Group Visits Lithuania

LD2509215990 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report by ELTA-TASS correspondent Arturas Mankjavicius]

[Texus] Vilnius September 25 TASS—A delegation from the group of parties of Christian Democrats of the European Parliament paid a two-day visit to Lithuania.

During a meeting with Lithuanian Parliament Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis, they discussed prospects for parliamentary ties. Landsbergis expressed gratitude to the parties for their suport of Lithuania's right to self-determination.

"Europe is looking forward to Lithuania's return to its family because nobody can replace you," Ria Oumen Rujten, vice president of the group and head of the delegation, said in his address to members of the Lithuanian Parliament.

She assured them that the parties of Christian Democrats in Europe and their representatives in the European Parliament would work to help the doors to Europe be opened to Lithuania.

The delegation also met Lithuanian vice premier Algirdas Brazauskas, head of the Lithuanian Catholic Church Cardinal Vincentas Sladkevicius and representatives of the Lithuanian parties of Christian Democrats. It toured the Trakaj Castle and the sights of Kaunas.

Lithuanian Government Adopts Various Resolutions

LD2509230190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] A large number of resolutions were adopted at today's government meeting which was chaired by Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene.

The most important of these concerns the regulation of the order of sales of goods, their transport from enterprises and from Lithuania, and also their sending out of Lithuania.

In addition, some resolutions were also adopted at the meeting governing the determination of legal personnel compensation, the implementation among the population of the pension law, and the order of establishment and disbursement of non-budgeted capital and funds.

Lithuanian Radio's Second Channel Reorganized

LD2509152590 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 24 Sep 90

[From the "DX Club" program]

[Text] [Announcer] Today I will tell you about the latest plans to reorganize the second program of the Lithuanian radio home service.

Two newly-established broadcasting organizations have made claims to air time of the transmitters of the second program of the Lithuanian radio home service. These are Radijo Centras and Vilnius Varpas.

As you might know, on [word indistinct] from 0700 to 1500 hours UTC, these transmitters carry the first program of Lithuanian Radio home service in parallel to the usual first program transmitters. This situation is no doubt unjustifiable from the economical point of view. The launching of parallel transmitters placed in the same site hardly, if at all, improves the reception conditions of a given program. Thus it becomes (?evident) that this time slot had to be filled with a regional program, otherwise the transmitter should be switched off. However, a reduction of the air time is undesirable for the [word indistinct] ministry which is concerned in the profit brought by (?leasing) the transmitters to the Lithuanian radio. On the other hand, Lithuanian radio officials have stated several times that they have no technical means to expand the amount of programs. That is why the new broadcasters, Radijo Centras and Vilnius Varpas, are offering their assistance in this issue.

Both these broadcasters are in the stage of foundation and do not broadcast any programs yet. Vilnius Varpas, which by the way means the Bell of Vilnius in English, is a commercial radio station set up by three professional Lithuanian radio [word indistinct]. It plans to produce programs on culture, ecology, national minorities, and folk music with emphasis on the Lithuanian cultural heritage. The station would use the program production facilities of the Lithuanian radio and seek financing from the [word indistinct] budget.

Radijo Centras is a joint venture of the entertainment company Centras and the joint stock Lietuvos Rytas. It is founded after the new organization of the youth radio station M1 which was established more than a year ago by the Lithuanian Komsomol and was on the air from 31st December 1989 to 31st May 1990. Radijo Centras will produce the same sort of programs that the former M1 did, that is information on current events and music emphasizing on modern music for young people. The station would use the premises of M1 and would be financed by the two founders Centra and Lietuvos Rytas. The transmitting security is being financed by the Lithuanian radio.

Two weeks ago a session of the Board of the Lithianian Radio and Television took place to discuss the proposal. Due to the collision of interests of the two broadcasters a compromise had to be found. It was formulated by the editor-in-chief of Radijo Centras [name indistinct], a member of the Lithuanian DX Club by the way. He proposed that Vilnius Varpas should fill in the time between 0700 and 1100 hours UTC and Radijo Centras between 1100 and 1500 UTC. Five-minute news bulletins compiled by the Lithuanian radio should be inserted on the hour. The whole program lasts from 0700 to 1500 UTC, it shares common identification tunes and a common name, for example Delta. The Vilnius Board reacted positively to the proposals and decided to send it on to the experts for approval.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Denounces Anti-Semitism

PM2609095590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent Colonel M. Ziyeminsh under the rubric "Direct Line": "Against Anti-Semitism and Genocide"]

[Text] Riga—On 19 September Latvia's Supreme Soviet adopted a declaration condemning anti-Semitism and genocide and deeming them inadmissible in the republic. Correct and stable interethnic relations, the document states, can be formed only given a fair assessment of the past. But what is there in the past of the peoples inhabiting Latvia? Which pages of history need additional interpretation and assessments?

Starting in 1940, several waves of repression swept over the republic, claiming victims among representatives of all the ethnic groups inhabiting Latvia. During the years of the Hitlerite occupation genocide was carried out against the Jewish people, as a result of which at least 80,000 Lettish Jews and no less than 200,000 Jews from other European countries died.

Those who helped to carry out the terror unleashed by the occupiers included citizens of Latvia. There is and can be neither justification nor a period of limitation for a crime against mankind, for bloody genocide against the

Jewish people, the declaration states. The text goes on to point out that the republic is concerned to perpetuate the memory of the Jewish victims of genocide and also to preserve the memory of those citizens of Latvia who tried to and did save people at risk to their own life.

Latvia's Supreme Soviet declared that it will not tolerate any manifestations of anti-Semitism and national discrimination. It urged all state organs and organs of self-management, public organizations, and citizens to create for the Jews of Latvia, as well as for all national minorities, favorable conditions for the restoration and development of their national culture, education, and scientific and religious institutions and the implementation of cultural-national autonomy. The hope was also expressed that "our former fellow countrymen in Israel will preserve all-around contacts with Latvia."

Latvian Militia To Guard Moscow Delegation

LD2509161990 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0900 GMT 21 Sep 90

[Text] The permanent delegation in Moscow of the Council of Ministers of Latvia will in the future be guarded by the militia of Latvia. For this purpose a group of workers of the republic's Ministry of Internal Affairs has arrived there; these specialists are familiarizing themselves with the possibilities of using modern means of guarding equipment. It is envisaged that in time militia workers will be replaced by young men of Latvia, who will be on alternative service on the territory of the delegation.

New Baltic Newspaper To Be Published

90P50116

[Editorial Report] Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 21 August 1990 carries on page 4 a 400-word report announcing the publication, in the near future, of a new newspaper called THE INDEPENDENT BALTIC NEWSPAPER [NEZAVISIMAYA BALTIYSKAYA GAZETA]. This newspaper is billed as a socio-political weekly, 16 pages in length, with a run of 100,000 copies. The newspaper will be devoted to "today's problems of the Baltics, tomorrow's problems of the Union," and is aimed at the all-Union reader.

In a "sea" of new publications, THE INDEPENDENT BALTIC NEWSPAPER reflects: "full independence from governmental structures and political parties, tolerance toward different points of view and their coexistence on the pages of a newspaper, although, if one is speaking of the position of THE INDEPENDENT BALTIC NEWSPAPER, it is closer to the platform of Yeltsin than of Gorbachev, to the social democrats than to the communists, to the idea of independent equal states than to the union of unequal republics."

The newspaper will feature journalists who continue to experience a lack of freedom while working in the official press. Among these will be: A. Baksberg, Yu. Shchekochikhin, I. Klyamkin, T. Karyagina, N. Logionov. O Morozov, Yu. Rost. The paper will also have its own correspondents in Estonia and Lithuania.

The report goes on to state that "the materials published in THE INDEPENDENT BALTIC NEWSPAPER will convince the reader that there are still many forbidden topics and much unrevealed information. From the first few issues the reader will learn how Soviet generals live, why the blockade of Lithuania failed, what it means to find yourself in the middle of the night in the reception area of one of the best clinics in Riga, what are the reasons why Russians are leaving Central Asia, and will acquaint himself with excerpts from the book by former KGB General O. Kalugin and from Yu. Rost's book on Sakharov."

The first issues of the newspaper will be in the Russian language, with parallel publications in the Baltic languages in the works. Plans for the future include publication of the newspaper in English and German.

RSFSR

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings Detailed

Local Government Law Discussed

LD2609114490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 26 September broadcasts a 2.5-minute report by Andrey Nikiforov from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet session in Moscow.

Nikiforov begins his report by recalling that at a recent session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, the deputies did not approve the draft law on local soviets of people's deputies and local self-government. He goes on to report that the committee that worked on that draft law is now reworking it and has offered draft recommendations for consideration which are based on Yeltsin's meeting with the chairmen of soviets at various levels. There was also a meeting of deputies from Moscow oblast soviets together with RSFSR peoples' deputies and members of the committee on the work of soviets who also discussed this new law. Among them, Nikiforov adds, was Professor Barabashov who has put forward his own draft law. Meanwhile, the legislative committee is currently reexamining the draft law on the recall of RSFSR peoples' deputies and the regulations concerning their assistants.

Nikiforov goes on to say: "I would like to report that the constitutional commission is currently working in Arkhangelsk; it is not here. It will work there for two weeks. It will be working on the text of a new constitution for the Russian Federation.

"I would also like to report that almost at this very moment a meeting between Ivan Stepanovich Silayev,

the Russian prime minister, and an official parliamentary delegation from Bulgaria headed by Prime Minister Lukanov has finished. Unfortunately, I do not know which issues were discussed. The meeting has only just finished."

Nikiforov concludes by reporting that 300,000 copies of the "500 days" program have been published and the general public can purchase a copy for two rubles.

'500 Days' Legal Framework Formed

LD2509114190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Russian members of parliament are today working in committees and commissions. The preparation of laws is going on. They will form the legal framework for the "500 days" program.

Health Minister Appointed

PM2509140990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On Assertion of Composition of RSFSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] decrees:

That in addition to the 14 July and 8 September 1990 RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolutions "On the Approval of the Composition of the RSFSR Council of Ministers," the following be approved:

that Vyacheslav Ivanovich Kalinin be approved as RSFSR minister of health.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets
[Dated] Moscow, 19 September 1990.

Resolution on Chernobyl Committee

PM2509135590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Law "On RSFSR State Committee for Elimination of Consequences of Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station Accident"]

[Text] In accordance with the Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] 29 May 1990 resolution "On Urgent Measures To Eliminate the Consequences of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] in a Number of RSFSR Oblasts," the RSFSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. That an RSFSR state committee for the elimination of the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl AES be formed. It should be situated in Bryansk City.

2. That Article 1 of the 14 July 1990 RSFSR Law "On Republican Ministries and State Committees of the RSFSR," after the words "RSFSR State Committee for Land Reform," should have added to it the words "RSFSR State Committee for the Elimination of the Consequences of the Accident at the Chernobyl AES."

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, Moscow, RSFSR House of Soviets
[Dated] 19 September 1990.

Resolution on 'Sciences' Decision

PM2509125390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolution dated 21 September: "On the Suspension of Article 2 of the USSR President's Decree 'On the Status of the USSR Academy of Sciences'"]

[Text] The RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] House of Soviets, Moscow—In connection with the fact that Article 2 of the USSR President's Decree of 23 August 1990 "On the Status of the USSR Academy of Sciences" contradicts the RSFSR Declaration of State Sovereignty and the RSFSR Law of 14 July 1990 "On Property on RSFSR Territory," the RSFSR Supreme Soviet resolves as follows:

Article 2 of the USSR President's Decree of 23 August 1990 "On the Status of the USSR Academy of Sciences" is to be suspended on the RSFSR's territory, and the suggestion is to be put to the USSR president that he repeal Article 2 of the said decree.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet

Resolution on Soviet Newspapers

PM2509132590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[RSFSR Supreme Soviet decree "On RSFSR Supreme Soviet Newspapers and Journals and Newspapers of Local Soviets of People's Deputies"]

[Text] Fulfilling the decision of the first congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputies on the creation of Russian mass media, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

1. That RSFSR Supreme Soviet newspapers and journals be instituted.

That the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media, Ties With Public Organizations and Citizens' Mass Movements, and the Study of Public Opinion, in conjunction with the RSFSR Ministry of the Press and Mass Media, organize as of October 1990 the publication of RSFSR Supreme Soviet newspapers and journals.

2. That distrust be expressed in the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA editorial collegium.

That it be proposed to the CPSU Central Committee that it hand over SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Mass Media, Ties With Public Organizations and Citizens' Mass Movements, and the Study of Public Opinion must submit within a week for approval by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet a nomination for the post of chief editor of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

3. That the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium create a commission for distributing the property and printing plant base of the Moscow party publishing houses with a consideration for the necessary compensation for state funds invested in their developemnt and lost profit.

4. That the RSFSR Council of Ministers and local soviets of people's deputies decide the question of the return of local publishing house capacities to the ownership of the soviets of people's deputies before January 1991.

5. That the autonomous republic supreme soviets; autonomous oblast and autonomous okrug soviets of people's deputies; and kray, oblast, city, and rayon soviets of people's deputies in the RSFSR resolve the question of the independent publication of their press organs as of 1 January 1991.

[Signed] B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, House of RSFSR Soviets
[Dated] 22 September 1990.

Constituent Congress Adopts 'Anti-Market' Mood

90UN2833A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by Valeriy Vyzhutovich: "Scenes From the Second Act—the Constituent Congress of the RSFSR Communist Party in Declarations and in Reality"]

[Text] After more than a two-month break, the Constituent Congress of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] resumed and completed its work in three days.

I observed these political scenes at first while riveted to the television in a crowded "anteroom" filled with journalists, and later in the Palace of Congresses after some colleagues and I received a pass to the balcony. Twenty years of daily newspaper work with experience in interpreting all kinds of representative meetings—whether a congress, a conference, or whatever else—schooled me to use restraint in reports and accounts. And so once again the hurried pen chasing after events involuntarily left gaps between the lines which I feel a sharp and urgent need to fill this time.

So these notes are in no way a detailed account that binds the author to a strict and almost stenographic impartiality. This is a chronicle of my own thoughts and feelings about what was seen and heard in three days, and the main theme of the narrative is alarm. Frankly, it surfaced as early as the "first act" whose distinct genre A. Nuykin defined, as I recall, with the title of his article: "Tragedy? No, It Is Now a Farce."

Now it can be said: Alas, it is not a farce. Everything unfortunately is much more serious than one would like to believe.

"We Are Ready To Cooperate With All Progressive Forces"

I. Polozkov, the first secretary of the Central Committee of the RSFSR Communist Party, proclaimed this from the rostrum (the titles of the succeeding sections of this article are sentences from his report). But language, as is well-known, was also given to politicians in order to conceal their thoughts. However language can also be treacherous—it reveals the true motives of the mind. Ivan Kuzmich is clearly not ready to consider as progressive those "forces that very much want not to permit the organizational and ideological unity of Russia's Communists," and consequently he is not ready to cooperate with these forces. Meanwhile it is precisely these forces that constitute a majority in the Russian parliament. The grounds for objecting to "organizational and ideological unity" in the platform presented by the congress are more than adequate, and not only among Russian parliamentarians.

What about cooperation then? Impossible. A majority of the delegates to the congress are inclined to think that all political opponents are reactionaries, and one of the speakers called the weekly KOMMERSANT a reactionary newspaper because it gave an insufficiently high assessment of the political and intellectual worth of the first secretary of the Russian Central Committee. Also subjected to ideological criticism for "anti-Soviet articles" were MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, IZVESTIYA, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and the journals KOMMUNIST, OGONEK, YUNOST....

Many of the speakers started by stating their adherence to political pluralism, but right after that and without realizing it they themselves began to stigmatize dissidents. F. Sushkov, the first secretary of the Michurinsk Gorkom [city party committee] who wholeheartedly welcomed both glasnost and freedom of opinions, announced that "the party must be implacable toward ideological vacillation and the unscrupulousness of its members...." "Such people have to be exposed and driven out of our party," recommended A. Loshkarev, the first secretary of the Ruzayevskiy Gorkom. In spirit and indeed in words these speeches seemed to me to be consonant with the speech of another speaker. "We have only one condition: The opposition must disarm itself completely and fully, both in an ideological and in an organizational sense. (Exclamations of: 'Right!' Prolonged applause). It must stigmatize mistakes that it commits, mistakes that turned into crimes against the party.... Either that or let them leave the party. And if

they do not leave we will kick them out. (Exclamations: 'Right!' Prolonged applause)."

Stalin said this in 1927 at the 25th party congress.

A return to what, tell me, denotes compulsory unity and authoritative demands to renounce opinions and convictions? Is rightness worth anything when it is asserted by stamping one's foot, exclamations, and the clapping down of opponents? And is it rightness if its only symbol is belonging to a majority and nothing more?

It seems to me that the congressional delegates were much more concerned with the erection of class barriers, ideological demarcations, and an organizational rebuff of "anticommunist and antisoviet parties" than with the matter for which they had really assembled—the development of a program of actions. I watched, listened, and wanted to ask: Whether the respected defenders of the interests of the working class and of all workers (this is the way, without false modesty, that the founders of the Russian Communist Party present themselves) understand that the country is on the brink of a catastrophe and that to apply an ideological luster to a dogma and class values that are worn-out from long use means to lose the last chance. No, judging from the speeches they were most troubled by the purity of teaching and the loyalty to ideals and principles.

V. Kukarin, the first secretary of the Medvedevskiy Rayon Party Committee, shared an observation that was bitter for him: "Antisocialist forces are now fighting what is most valuable to the Soviet individual...." Well, what would you think is the most valuable thing for the Soviet individual who is worn out from standing in lines, from impoverished everyday living, and from rising prices; who is experiencing a shameful shortage of daily needs—a roof over the head, trousers, shoes, and food, including bread now? "World outlook, ideology...?" Really? No, the party worker believes there is nothing more valuable for the Soviet person when, according to the observation of another delegate, "the propaganda of the bourgeois way of life is intensifying."

The creators of the Russian Communist Party however do not deny guilt for the weakening of the ideological struggle, as also for the "mistakes committed during perestroyka." In V. Kukarin's opinion, today's miscalculations are in many ways explained by the fact that the party was forced to act partly intuitively, relying more on common sense than on theory." If only that were so! If the long years of scoffing at common sense stopped and it triumphed in the end over a dead stereotyped pattern, and if ideological sanctity did not prevent us from living and developing as the entire civilized world lives and develops, we would not find ourselves at the outermost limits. But now when we are trying with an agonizing effort to rid ourselves of superstitions and prejudices, we are beginning to value the normal and natural human course of events, to trust life itself, and to respect common sense—now at a new turning point in history there is a new replenishment of ideological overseers who are trying to save "dogma" at a catastrophic price which, if we still delay, the people will pay. The people have paid and paid for this belief which was thrust upon them for 80 years in the communist coming—is it not enough?

"No!" I. Boltovskiy, a Moscow taxi driver and candidate of philosophical sciences, says with conviction. "It was not socialism that led society to the edge of a precipice but specific people. They have titles, names, and positions. It is they who threw the people's money at unnecessary and at times harmful projects."

And then it began to smell of "acts of sabotage," and there was the "enemy of the people." Names, titles, and positions? If you please, academicians S. Shatalin and V. Tikhonov; corresponding member P. Bunich; and doctors of economic sciences G. Popov and N. Shmelev. Reviling the scientists—as if they "led society" and not that order of things which made it possible with dictatorial, ignorant, and absolute power to command both science and the economy and everything on earth—is the favorite occupation of the builders of class barriers. True there is no need to stand on ceremony with this "corrupt intelligentsia," as a worker from Leningrad put it, interrupting the applause of the hall.

And it is no wonder that the angry finger is again aimed at someone: Guilty! The administrative system from time immemorial defends itself from encroachments on its own existence by a search for individual culprits. Everything that is good comes from the regime. Everything that is bad comes from unfit workers. The cadres decide everything, is that not so?

Nor have the creators of the Russian Communist Party repudiated the ideas of the class struggle. N. Shmytko, the first secretary of the Borovskiy Rayon Party Committee worries that "the masses of the people are beginning to believe the fables about the artificiality of class interests and about their complete compatibility, for example, with the interests of the working class, the peasantry, and the native underground bourgeois class."

The communist ideology of absolute power has not been repudiated: "When I hear and read articles about the demonopolization of communist ideology here in our country, I always think about the slyness of the authors of such articles and about their selfish deception of the large masses of the population. Therefore, I am against abandoning the supremacy of our communist ideology...."

They have not repudiated the search for disguised enemies: "The election of the first secretary (I. Polozkov—V.V.) was a signal to the 'director' to start the concert of persecution of Ivan Kuzmich. I do not know who this 'director' is, but I think that he exists. Everything is turning out to be extremely coordinated. I think that the leadership of the country and of the CPSU knows both the 'director' and the sponsors of this orchestra. It is

time, Mikhail Sergeyevich, and I appeal to you as president, to release this to the people and to name names. The people want this."

Not everything was broadcast, and not everything got into newspaper accounts. So that to some the constituent meeting of the Russian Communist Party could by chance have seemed entirely seemly and appropriate for the times. But what do you call this summary of views that were displayed openly, loudly, and aggressively?

"We Are for the Economic Emancipation of the Individual"

I searched through the draft program of actions that was published just 10 days before the start of the second phase of the congress for ideas and proposals on the transition to a market. I searched and I found. The task itself was not formulated. That is, do we need a market or not? The program announcement of the 28th CPSU Congress answers taht it is necessary. The draft program of actions of the Russian Communist Party that was submitted to the delegates was confined to a hazy silence on this subject. Almost nothing was said about a market economy, other than a sentence about the fact that in switching to a market social guarantees should not be forgotten.

The congress introduced lucidity: "It is constantly drummed into our heads that there is no alternative to the market. This is exaggerated in the press. But we must understand in the end: The one who will own the means of production is also the one who will have power. Now the people still own the means of production. But under the conditions of a market, it turns out, they will be given to private capital, the people will be removed from power, and a change will take place in the political system." And the conclusion: There is an alternative to the market! "Uralmash" worker Ye. Tachayeva is in favor of this although it is not clear what means of production she owns personally and in what way. And there was no speaker in the hall who could explain to this nice woman—very likely a working woman who sincerely wants happiness and good for us—that the formula "everything around is the people's, everything around is mine" does not have a political, economic, or practical content—that it is nothing but demagogy and we are fed up with it.

"While the official economy is going to pieces, the shadow economy for some reason is flourishing today... gathering strength, the framework of socialism became cramped for those in the shadow economy within and they are now openly longing for power." This was said without embarrassment by a Moscow taxi driver whose colleagues in the capital—I do not know about others—almost to a man are engaged in the use of state-owned vehicles as private conveyances, charging exorbitant prices while being mercilessly rude and insulting to passengers. It is he, a candidate of philosophy, who does not know in what kind of system there emerged and flourishes the monopolistic opportunity to insult, overcharge, and shortchange passengers, customers, and buyers with impunity?! No, dear delegate, it is not the "teneviki" [dealers in the shadow economy]—how quickly this invented little word has entered the everyday vocabulary—who are the problem, it is those "operators and bigwigs" of the domestic state sector who do not understand competition who rip us off more and oftener. And as long as the command-administrative system exists and until the competition of free enterprises begins, you and I will have to go to them with hat in hand, humiliate ourselves and overpay.

What strikes the eye overall is the acute inclination of the creators of the Russian Communist Party to see everything from a "political standpoint." Our daily bread and everything by which we live are hurt and suffer, they push into the shadow—this little word that has favor with many is appropriate here—and no other tasks come to light. Teacher Z. Vasilyeva: "...The party always had a very responsible mission—education of the individual. I do not think that in a time of economic crisis, and when store shelves are empty, that this mission of the party has been set aside. Of course it is very important to feed a person. But we should not measure the standard of living only with the availability, for example, of sausage." G. Fedorova, chairman of a kolkhoz [collective farm]: "I, a peasant by origin and also in my present situation, am disturbed by the condition of our rural community and the fate of the Non-Chernozem region. It is not only the abundance of our table that depends on it (of course this is important...) but I am alarmed also by the political side of the question."

The anti-market mood of the congress can be illustrated with numerous examples, but I think something else is important—to understand why there is such stubborn opposition to common sense and what its source is. It seems to me that the answer lies in an unintentional admission of one of the speakers: "We know that there already are cooperatives where there is exploitation. Can the rayon party organization do something in this cooperative? Comrades, we understand that we cannot, inasmuch as those being exploited and who receive a salary much higher than in a state enterprise for the same or even less work will not appeal to us for help."

Well at least it is frank: To whom and why will I, a secretary of a rayon party committee, be necessary if state serfs become free workers who are fed not by decisions of the party aktivs but by their own brains, talent, and enterprise?

There in essence is everything that stands behind the appeals not to permit the exploitation of man by man—exploitation of a person by the state is always permissible—and the harsh demands to adhere rigorously to socialist ideals and principles.

"We Share the Assessments of the 28th Congress"

"Nonsynchronized" is the way television specialists categorize the failure of sound and image to converge. "We

share the assessments of the 28th congress" is obviously politically "nonsynchronized": The declaration and the real intentions here are in sly discord. This obvious discrepancy was pointed out by delegates O. Latsis (noise in the hall), A. Barinov, A. Godunov (noise, banging), V. Yelagin, V. Zaytsev (noise in the hall was repeated 18 times!)—a subdued minority whose attempts to break the course of the congress, judging by the reaction, were deliberately condemned to failure.

And so let us compare. In the program declaration of the 28th congress, the main task of socio-economic development is proclaimed to be the legal and economic freedom of the individual. But in the program of actions of the Russian Communist Party, it is the priority of the economy for the sake of the economy. The interests of the individual are subordinated to the full power of the state.

Second. The draft retains an anti-market spirit which once again cannot be said about the program declaration of the 28th congress. It allows the prohibition of any enterprises whose owners are not the workers themselves. Thus, in contrast to the CPSU, the Russian Communist Party does not recognize any private, lease, or joint-stock company property.

Third. According to an evaluation of delegate A. Godunov, the draft makes a fatal concession to Stalinism. On the one hand, it is disposed to a struggle with anticommunist and antisocialist forces, and on the other hand it proposes to consider that the paramount task "in the area of theory is the development of a modern concept of socialism." Consequently, as long as the paramount task is not resolved, it is proposed that Communists rebuff dissidents. This denotes a proud rejection of cooperation with parties that do not experience the necessary respect for the word "socialism."

In the end, the Russian Communist Party, unlike the CPSU, resolutely ignores the danger that arises from rightist, conservative forces.

And nevertheless the Moscow delegates were able to persuade the congress to wait a little with the adoption of the program. By a majority of votes the draft was sent back for redoing. On its basis, the Central Committee was instructed to develop the main directions of the activity of the Communist Party, to discuss them in all party organizations, and to approve them not later than December.

My opinion: It is not possible to do better than this.

We are dealing with people who will not accept perestroyka and the policy of its initiator M. Gorbachev—every time one of the speakers allowed himself to make sharp, at times coarse and more often unfair attacks on the president and general secretary, the hall applauded vindictively. I. Vtorushin, a milling-machine operator from Tyumen, expressed his feelings clearly and unequivocally: "I must note that the appeal can be heard more and more in worker collectives: 'Return the country to 1985!'" If it was up to him he would, just like Professor M. Popov from Leningrad who assessed our social renewal as a "counterrevolution in pure form." So the professor and the worker are of one mind, and they repeated: the rotten intelligentsia, the struggle of class interests....

Perhaps never in recent times has political conservatism declared itself with such aggressive openness.

We are dealing with political figures who have applied a lot of energy to earn the public reputation of conservatives who are steadfast and consistent enemies of change.

As for I. Polozkov, the first secretary of the Russian Central Committee... I will refrain from assessments; there were a lot of them in the press. And indeed I admit that I do not once more want to please Ivan Kuzmich, who said: "I take the ideological attacks of enemies to be praise." I want to ask something else: Does the party need at its head a person who, in the words of delegate A. Barinov, "could not tread a path" to the leaders of the republic, who could not find a common language with the highest leadership of Russia..., who could not find a common language with leaders... of leftist parties..., with the mass media..., with the leadership of the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League]?" And to complete this thought logically I will quote a fragment from the speech by delegate V. Zaytsev: "We talked all the time about the consolidation of all forces of society. Does our choice serve these aims? Can it really not be seen that with Comrade Polozkov in the leadership the RSFSR Communist Party enters into a fight against both the Central Committee of the party and the Supreme Soviet of Russia. Discarding our pride why should we not look for a figure who would serve the aims of consolidating society...."

And nevertheless, perhaps we should not really exaggerate the danger from the right? Well, deal with the Russian Communist Party calmly and with restraint as West European countries treat extremist parties and groups that do not threaten the stability of society and that have reliable guarantees of freedom, democracy, and prosperity. We do not yet have these guarantees in our country, and it is difficult to say whether we will have them soon. The situation in the country is such that the slightest disturbance of the shaky equilibrium can have fatal consequences. Nostalgia for a firm hand is voiced more and more frequently and louder. And somebody probably hopes secretly that in the end the day will come when the tired and enfeebled people, cursing all of our liberal undertakings, will themselves ask for a dictatorship. And they will get it in full.

...In closing I. Polozkov thanked the delegates and all of the participants for their active work. Three days of truth about the party, he said, were behind us.

About which one specifically? If it is about the Russian Communist Party, then it is difficult not to agree with this assessment.

Yeltsin Discusses Economy, Gorbachev's 'Mistake'

LD2609095890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0907 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Kishinev, 26 Sep (MOLDOVAPRESS-TASS)—Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin was interviewed by a Moldavia national TV and radio correspondent on the signing of a treaty between the RSFSR and the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic.

He evaluated the government's program for transition to a market economy, pointing out that it envisages the formation of a market "by various decrees and resolutions from above" which, in his view, is of no use.

"We have already wasted 73 years on this", the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman said. "It is obvious where it has got us. Today's events (referring to the signing of the treaty between the RSFSR and Moldavia) will provide a stimulus for the further development of our republics".

Replying to the correspondent's request to speak about Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in which "the Moldavian legislators were criticized", Boris Yeltsin stated in part:

"I believe that this is not the president's first mistake, particularly on issues of attitude to the republics, sovereign states that have already declared their state sovereignty. It is unethical, to put it mildly. We saw in his words the attitude to our sovereignty as well".

The correspondent reminded his partner in conversation that his call for his compatriots to return to Russia had aroused a sharply negative reaction in Moldavia, pointing out that a number of the republic's newspapers, "especially from the separatist areas," are publishing articles that bear witness to "low prestige among his population" for Yeltsin.

"I am not going to say anything about my general prestige around the country," the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman observed, "and in Russia even less so. But I would like to say that there are those who are using an incorrect interpretation of what I said for unseemly political ends. What I was talking about was that, if our compatriots abroad and in other republics express a wish, for whatever reason, to come to Russia's soil, then the Russians will accept them and they will take every step to create the appropriate conditions for them to work and live."

"That was the tone of my message; it was not an appeal to all 60 million Russians who live outside of Russia to come to Russia straight away. It would be madness on my part to put out such a message. We will not be putting people off, driving them out; we will not be acting against them".

Finance Minister Discusses Price Issues

LD2509205790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 25 September carries a 10-minute "Topical Interview" recorded feature in which Boris Grigoryevich Fedorov, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic minister of finance, and (Mikhail Lvovich Berger), IZVESTIYA economic observer, visit Kuznetskiy Most—one of Moscow's main shopping streets—and the Central Market. They talk about the money in Soviet people's pockets, state finances, and how life should go on now.

Fedorov says of the foreign currency shop on Kuznetskiy Most that he would not close it but would compel it to sell goods for rubles, albeit at high prices. Referring to the Union government decision to expand the network of foreign currency shops, Fedorov says: "I think there are several reasons for this. First, there is the incompetence of this government since the elementary things that any schoolchild in a normal country knows only make an impression on them with great difficulty. Second, perhaps they are concerned about the interests of a narrow group of people who have that foreign currency, and street scenes.

Fedorov states that every shop should look like the Central Market just as in other countries, for example Finland beyond the Arctic Circle. Asked about the program for price formation, Fedorov says: "What Ryzhkov is proposing is a routine, administrative rise in prices which will naturally provoke a further rise in prices on the market." He goes on to say that prices rises in the shops will only jack up prices in the market, and "therefore we believe that it is time to put an end to these administrative attempts to correct prices, to establish them." Fedorov continues: "You (the consumer) will gain in principle if the implementation of our program is successful, this selection of goods should be in all the shops, naturally not at the prices that there are at the present time. They will rise higher, but not as high as here in the Central Market. They will be lower than here," Fedorov states. He says that nothing will happen in a single day, that there will be stage-by-stage price rises. Exotic products such as kiwi fruit which are not currently available will have prices that are set freely. "But on those things that most people eat, naturally the prices will have to be restrained for a sufficiently long period so that people do not go hungry." The aim of the program will be to avoid drastic leaps in prices.

Fedorov concludes: "One cannot live like this. We shall apply every effort, and I hope nonetheless that the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Supreme Soviet of the republic will support us and that we shall start to get on with things at last instead of spending our time talking as we have done for the last few years. Unfortunately, perestroyka has not done anything specific."

Baklanov Visits 'Tense' Sverdlovsk Oblast

PM2509155590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "No Time To Lose"]

[Text] The situation is tense in Sverdlovsk Oblast. People are tired of waiting in line, of constant shortages of goods and food. Preparations for winter are unsatisfactory and the bumper harvest is in danger of being lost.

This is largely due to the local authorities' sluggishness and irresponsibility.

It emerged during numerous conversations between CPSU Central Committee Secretary O.D. Baklanov as well as the oblast's Communists and working people that the party bosses are giving in to difficulties, often on the pretext that the party has transferred authority to the soviets and are avoiding participating in the solution of acute socioeconomic problems.

Naturally, the transition to the market economy was the central topic during the tour of the oblast.

The Communists told the Central Committee secretary of their serious concern that the USSR Supreme Soviet's current examination of the programs for a transition to the market without prior discussion by working people and consideration of their views could have grave and unpredictable consequences.

In this connection O.D. Baklanov stressed that party committees and party organizations must now carefully study and evaluate the effect of the proposed measures to rescue the economy from the crisis on every collective and every person, especially on his social protection. It is important for people to know and see that it is members of the CPSU who are above all defending the population's vital needs, perhaps even to the detriment of their personal interests.

The Central Committee secretary drew attention to the fact that at the most difficult times Communists have always been in the forefront, leading the people by personal example. Such a time is now upon us.

Murder of Army Captain by Civilian Reported

PM2609092990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent A. Solarev: "Captain's Death"]

[Excerpts] Kuybyshev Oblast—You rapidly grow accustomed to something that happens all the time. So we long ago grew accustomed to reports from virtually all regions of the country about the death of officers. The main Army newspaper once reported that last year almost 60 representatives of the profession which can be defined very briefly as defending the Motherland died at the hands of murderers. Many of them met their deaths on the peaceful streets of our cities and villages. And that is crazy.

So far I do not know what the doleful list is this year. I only know that Captain Marat Nafikov, 32 years old, will be on that list.

The captain took a long time to die. For almost five days the heart of the trained sportsman sent out signals to his destroyed brain: "Wake up! Start working!" The signals did not reach his brain and then his heart stopped. His colleagues, who prepared him for his final journey to his native Ufa, told me: "The upper part of his body was black with bruises. He had been kicked. That was later, when Marat had fallen down. First there was a blow to his head. A blow which split his skull. A blow which left a crack which even ran through the base of his skull. That is the name for the part of the skull on which the brain lies."

Who delivered that blow? So far the investigation has no answer. But one thing is clear: It was the work of a civilian. The same civilian for whom Marat donned shoulder boards, obeying his military duty, not thinking whether he would be advancing toward a mortal danger.... [passage omitted]

Colonel General A. Makashov, commander of the Volga-Urals military district, sent a letter to the rayon and oblast soviets. It says in particular: "We have lost a skilled, highly qualified 32-year-old officer.... This unprecedented, crazy incident has caused anger and indignation among the officers, ensigns, and entire personnel of the district."

But in a talk with me he stressed: This crazy crime was the direct result of anti-Army feelings, the anti-Army campaign which has been launched recently. It was not hooliganism but a serious crime against an officer, against a defender of the fatherland.

However regrettable it is to hear and realize, I cannot but agree with the commander. There is something wrong in Russia if Russians raise a hand against its defenders. [passage omitted]

Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk Said To Be in 'Hazardous State'

PM2509121990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Report by V. Feoktistov, V. Shinkarev from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] The new local organs of power have still not fully understood their role and the fact that it is necessary to move on from rallies, election euphoria, and project mania to concrete work. People are tired of disorder, mismanagement, and irresponsibility at all levels.

[Reporter] This fully applies also to Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. In my 15 years here I do not recall the city ever being in such a hazardous state. Churned-up pavements and sidewalks; whole streets dug up; trenches, sewers, and heat supply lines laid bare and abandoned. The winter is upon us, and surface and underground heat supply lines

are exposed to the elements. The heart of the city, the Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk TETS-1 [heat and electric power station], is also entering the winter in a pre-infarction state: totally worn out equipment, ash dumps overflowing, and the most highly skilled workers leaving to work in cooperatives, associations, and small enterprises. The power station collective, greatly depleted as a result of low wages, awaits with trepidation the onset of the cold weather, just like the city's main water supply facility, the Lugavskoy water intake installation. We reported on its critical state three months ago. The situation has not improved. Swarms of mosquitoes, rats, and other vermin—which breed even in winter in residential house cellars flooded with sewage—have become a real bane for the inhabitants of Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. [passage omitted]

Changes in Tatar Republic Press Reported

PM2509154590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Alyans Sabirov under the "Direct Line" rubric: "IZVESTIYA's Tatar Sister"]

[Text] Kazan—The Tatarstan Republic Supreme Soviet has set up its own IZVESTIYA in the Tatar and Russian languages.

The entire system of newspapers and journals is changing here before our very eyes. It is characterized by rapid development of the multinational press. For instance, an Udmurt newspaper has emerged in Kukmorskiy Rayon. The Union of Journalists has begun to publish a Chuvash herald. Tatar newspapers have been set up in Almetyevsk, Zainsk, Leninogorsk, Naberezhnyye Chelny, and Nizhnekamsk. Young readers have also received children's and young people's magazines in their native language. The first editions of SHAKHRI KAZAN have been published.

Another highly important feature is the emergence of independent publications. In September Kazan's VECHERKA began coming out without any mention of its old founders. The CPSU Gorkom [city party committee] voluntarily renounced the status of founder. But the city soviet categorically opposed giving the journalists their "freedom." However, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of the Press and Mass Media registered the association of creative staffers as the main founder of VECHERKA. The newspaper can now be circulated throughout Russia.

Western Republics

Belorussian Official Views Republic Independence

90UN2819A Riga BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA in Russian No 33, 28 Aug 90 p 3

[Interview with Oleg Anatolyevich Trusov, Belorussian SSR people's deputy and member of the Soym of the Belorussian People's Front, by BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA representative Yuriy Zubkov; place and date not given: "Sovereign Belorussia Enters Into Dialogue"—first paragraph is an editorial introduction]

[Text] We converse with Oleg Anatolyevich Trusov, Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputy and member of the Soym [Assembly] of the Belorussian People's Front. He is 36, an archaeologist by profession, and has about 500 scientific publications, including publications abroad.

[Zubkov] What is the purpose of your visit to Riga?

[Trusov] I came to discuss a number of questions with Latvian parliamentarians, the most important of which for us is that of the Belorussians of Latvia who occupy third place here in terms of population, after Latvians and Russians.

As we know, the Declaration on Belorussian Sovereignty was adopted on 27 July after Russia and the Ukraine, one point of which proclaims citizenship of Belorussia. And those Latvian Belorussians who for one reason or another do not desire to accept Latvian citizenship could be offered citizenship of Belorussia as an alternative to USSR citizenship. This question requires serious discussion with the Latvian parliament. We are also interested in opportunities for cultural autonomy for Belorussians of Latvia, beginning with the restoration of Belorussian general-education schools and including the organization of Belorussian television broadcasting. In addition, the "Belorussiya" Health Center is located in Jurmala which quite recently has been serving our republic nomenklatura. Since this facility was constructed using Belorussian money, we would very much like to see it used in rehabilitating victims of the Chernobyl tragedy.

And we also had to deal with the recent incident on the Latvian-Belorussian border concerning clearing out a section of forest in Belorussian territory and setting up border markers with the Latvian seal. The Latvian government declared it had nothing to do with this incident and promised to send us an official explanation. By the way, this occurrence could serve as a reason for us to establish a commission on border issues.

[Zubkov] You have come here as a parliamentarian of sovereign Belorussia. How do you see its future?

[Trusov] The Belorussian People's Front has long been discussing the possibility of creating a confederation of independent Belorussia, independent Ukraine, and Baltic republics—similar to the federation of West European countries being formed—with a common market, unit of currency for payments, and possibly an army.

Quite recently we became interested in an idea proposed by Russian democrats—a confederation of the three sovereign Slavic republics: Russia, the Ukraine, and Belorussia. In this regard we are greatly attracted to the possibility of reunification with Belorussia of its historic lands—parts of the Smolensk and Pskov areas. We

would like to discuss this question with Yeltsin. If he makes a positive decision in this regard, then residents of regions destroyed as a result of the Chernobyl catastrophe—Mogilev and Gomel Oblasts—would soon be able to move entire villages and settlements to these lands. I have travelled a great deal in the Smolensk and Pskov areas conversing with residents. They are prepared to meet new neighbors, especially since the lands stand empty. The people there feel they are Belorussians, especially in the border regions. They often know Belorussian better than some residents of Minsk or Gomel.

Belorussia's most likely Western partner is a reunited Germany. There is a historical reason for this—the Great Lithuanian Principality had close ties with the Hanseatic League. And there is practical interest, of course, since German business circles are striving to outdistance the Americans and French in assimilating the Belorussian market.

[Zubkov] There has always been a large European community in Belorussia. Today the exodus of Jews from the republic is growing rapidly. Perhaps they are afraid of flashes of anti-Semitism? Is this possible in Belorussia?

[Trusov] It appears the reason Jews are leaving is a different one—the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. With respect to anti-Semitism, this has never been manifest in Belorussia as it has in the Ukraine and Russia.

[Zubkov] What is your attitude toward the Union treaty?

[Trusov] The faction of the Belorussian People's Front in the Belorussian parliament is against signing the Union treaty. We believe Belorussia should conclude direct agreements with the republics which are within the composition of the USSR, and also with other governments.

[Zubkov] What do you wish to say to readers of BALTIYSKOYE VREMYA?

[Trusov] They should not forget that Belorussia has always been, and will remain, a good neighbor of Latvia. In spite of the destruction of old state structures in East Europe, we are hoping that relations between Latvia and Belorussia not only will not grow weaker, but on the contrary will become consolidated as relations between two free states.

Belorussian Investigators Will Not Visit Osh

LD2509124390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Belorussian Interior Minister Yegorov has cancelled his own instruction on sending a group of Belorussian investigators to Osh Oblast in Kirghizia. This happened following a meeting between the minister and a group of Belorussian people's deputies. They handed to the minister an appeal from officers in Minskiy rayon internal affairs bodies noting the inadvisability of this assignment because of the unfavorable crime situation in Belorussia itself.

The people's deputies are not refusing in principle to help other republics, but they think that help should be given voluntarily, and under conditions of cooperation this should be agreed in advance by the parliaments of the republics involved.

Moldavia Democrats Urge Rejection of Separatists

LD2509104190 Moscow TASS in English 1019 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas]

[Text] Kishinev September 25 TASS—The leaders of the sponsoring group of the Democratic Party for Moldavia's Revival and Progress have called on all people of goodwill to unite and stand out against separatists.

A statement issued by them says that Moldavia inherited a deep economic, political and ideological crisis from the system of management by decree and the diktat of the party apparatus.

This crisis has aggravated the social and political crisis in society, the document adds.

The activities by parliament and the government to stabilise the situation are being undermined by bureaucrats from old administrative structures and separatists who sabotage new decrees.

The statement stresses that parliament and the government now need, as never before, people's trust and support. It is very important not to make careless statements and take actions which can provoke anti-Moldavian sentiments.

The document notes that the abolition of the one-party system, and the transition to democratic forms of administration based on a multi-party system will create favourable conditions to overcome the crisis.

Supporting the general direction in the activities of the Moldavian People's Front (MPF), the Democratic Party doubts the correctness of some provisions and documents which were adopted by the Second MPF Congress.

This concerns the future name of the republic—the Romanian Republic of Moldova. The statement notes that these disputable provisions threaten a split in the front.

As for the social and political situation, in the opinion of the sponsoring group, it has been destabilised by the separatist actions of the Gagauz and Dnestr leaders, who proclaimed the so-called Gagauz republic in Komrat and the Dnestr Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic in Tiraspol.

This political advanturism is aimed at changing the state set-up of the Moldavian republic unconstitutionally and undermining its territorial integrity, the statement stresses.

Ukrainians Demand 'Order' Against Rising Prices

PM2509140390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by Sergey Tsikora under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Ukrainian Trade Unionists' Demand"]

[Text] Kiev—The Ukrainian Government must answer the republic's trade unions which have demanded that the authorities urgently establish order in the consumer market.

In their demand to the government, the republic's trade unions state that "not only durable goods but also prime necessities have almost completely disappeared from open sale" in the republic. There is increasing speculation in everyday goods at prices five to ten times the official rate, sometimes higher.

The picture on collective farm [kolkhoz] markets is just as depressing. Despite the fact that the Ukraine has produced its biggest harvest in recent decades, kolkhoz market prices have rapidly doubled.

The trade unions demand that the government report on the measures it is taking to stabilize the market and also on ways of guarding "against the possible exodus of goods, first and foremost foodstuffs, from the Ukraine."

The trade unions' demand ends on a note which this mass organization has virtually never used before. "If the authorities cannot guarantee the supply to the population of prime necessities at stable state prices, the republic's trade unions will insist on the introduction of pay indexation no later than the fourth quarter of this year."

Ukrainian Union Supports 27 Sep Strike Plans

LD2509162190 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Vladimir Yurkevich]

[Text] Donetsk September 25 TASS—At a meeting of their regional union, strike committees in the Donbass coalfield, south-eastern Ukraine, fully supported the demands of the Ukraine-wide strike scheduled for September 27.

The labour action was initiated by the Coordinating Council of the Association of Democratic Councils and Democratic Blocs in the Ukraine's Soviets, which was established two months ago.

The list of the demands includes the closure of the Chernobyl nuclear power station, returning Ukrainian servicemen from areas of national conflicts, the privitisation of property under worker committees' control and the nationalistation of the Ukrainian Communist Party's property.

"Miners cannot remain on the sidelines of solving these important issues," said Yuriy Boldyrev, a member of the Executive Committee of the Regional Union of the Donbass Strike Committees. "Therefore, we voted to support these demands. As to miners' participation in the labour action, we recommended miners making their own decision on the form of supporting the republic's democratically-minded public", Boldyrev said.

Ukrainian Official Discusses Party, Independence

90UN2861A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 38, 22-28 Sep 90 p 4

[Report on interview with Vyacheslav Chernovol, chairman of the Lvov Oblast Soviet, by I. Morzharetto; place and date not given: "Lvov. The Uneasy September"]

[Text] The journalist Vyacheslav Chernovol, son of village teachers, was arrested three times for his nationalistic, anti-Soviet activity and spent more than ten years behind barbed wire. Between his "terms" he worked as a stoker—they would not hire him anywhere else. He came out of prison after perestroyka began; he started to publish a newspaper and gathered a group of people with similar ideas that later became known as the Republican Party. When he became chairman of the Lvov Oblast Soviet he left the party so as to be above party preferences.

[Morzharetto] Vyacheslav Maksimovich, do you not think that razing Lenin monuments is an emotional step rather than a well-thought political measure?

[Chernovol] No, it is a political measure. Everybody understands perfectly well that these monuments have long ceased to be tributes to an outstanding personality and have become symbols of the ideology at power. In our oblast alone there were over 1,500 monuments to Lenin, not counting busts and portraits. But everyone sees the bankruptcy of the ideology that removed our country from the world progress. It pushed us backward and gave us our current beggarly life. It is one of the gloomiest pages of our history. The unanimous campaign to eliminate it started from beneath and not by an order from above. It includes everything: mass desertion from the party ranks, elimination of party committees at enterprises, and calls to remove the monuments. We are trying to divert this mass movement into a quiet channel and to avoid extreme situations. If we allow spontaneous destruction of a monument in one place, then it might become possible to raze something else or to set something on fire. That is why the issue of preserving or removing a monument should be decided at a local soviet session.

A special commission is working in Lvov now. There is information that the foundation of the monument was made of tombstones taken from the Polish, Jewish, and Ukrainian cemeteries. That is the kind of "international" monument they built: They were in a hurry, but there was a shortage of materials. So who is a barbarian?

[Morzharetto] Has any opposition to your party been formed in the Lvov area?

[Chernovol] No, unfortunately it has not.

[Morzharetto] Unfortunately?

[Chernovol] We are considered to be democrats, but not saints. We can be mistaken, so we need an opposition very much. I do not expect it from the Communist Party; they made such an attempt at the very beginning of the new soviet's work. A group of about 20 percent of the membership got together through the efforts of the oblast party committee [obkom], but not for long. At present, even if "blocs" of those who disagree on one or another issue emerge at present, they are an opposition from the left who insist on more radical measures.

[Morzharetto] What are your relations with the Ukrainian Obkom [Oblast Party Committee] in general?

[Chernovol] We do not have any, only that we work in the same building but we seem unable to share it. They condescended to allow us the use of one floor only after the court ordered them to do so. In addition to the soviet, some of the rooms will be taken by the new parties—they need to have a place to gather and work. The obkom officials, as they were leaving, removed all the antique door handles and chandeliers even though they were there since the time of the Austrian voivode—his residence was there. And how should we treat the continuing attempts to keep at any cost the printing shop and the publishing house they illegally took away from the oblast soviet executive committee [oblispolkom] 20 years ago?

[Morzharetto] You also have a conflict with the CPSU Central Committee organ PRAVDA....

[Chernovol] It is not the newspaper we do not like but the provocative policy the paper and its correspondent are conducting. In his articles he intentionally sets the Western Ukraine against the rest of the republic. Doing this he resorts to falsifications and juggling of facts. He calls me a nationalist, an extremist, a something else—all right, I do not mind. Let him be that way, I can get over this. I have been called worse. But then he writes that I said this and that, and then puts down quotation marks and an extensive quote "from me" that is all a complete lie. He claims that I stand for the separation of the Western Ukraine and that I call for persecution of Communists....

I am not hiding the fact that I support a federated Ukraine. The established economic zones like Donbass, Crimea, us, and others should have more rights to self-administration. But things written by Comrade Drozd and his newspaper are nothing but a provocation trying to start a feud. For this reason we had to ask him to leave our oblast.

[Morzharetto] But still, it would have been more democratic to try to settle the conflict through the court.

[Chernovol] We started legal proceedings, but the newspaper bureau has to leave Lvov due to the decision of the oblast soviet.

[Morzharetto] Do you have enough problems without them?

[Chernovol] Yes we do. It is very difficult since so many of them flooded us at once. The political problems we decide quite speedily and the people support us in that. But we cannot stop the economic crisis no matter how hard we try. A hungry, naked, and therefore angry person is not capable of sober thinking. He would rather follow the "powerful hand" that can provide some minimal living standards. And that would be the end! We will be thrown back forever. And so our primary goal is to provide those living standards ourselves, to resolve somehow the problem of food supplies. As soon as there is the slightest improvement the people will believe us. The fastest possible transition to the market economy is the way out.

[Morzharetto] Vyacheslav Maksimovich, suppose you got out of the crisis situation. What kind of Ukraine do you envision?

[Chernovol] A powerful, sovereign state.

[Morzharetto] As part of the USSR?

[Chernovol] As part of the community of other sovereign countries of Europe and Asia. We are entering a market economy and it does not have the kind of limits we got used to: borders with barbed wire and watchful border guards. There are economically profitable ties, but the ties based on similar idcologies are dying out. Why do I have to—and who can tell me to—take my goods to Cuba if it is more profitable for me to sell them to Turkey or to Lithuania? In other words we want to see the Ukraine, and Russia and Moldova and Tatariya and other republics—which are the best for all of us—as an independent democratic country, open to the West as well as to the East.

Crimean Soviet Urges Urge 'Return' of Tatars

PM2509142590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Masayev under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Crimean Problems"]

[Text] Simferopol—The just-concluded Third Session of the Crimean Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies has declared that all-Union and republic ministries and

departments are delaying the implementation of a program to return Crimean Tatars to the oblast and are thus exacerbating the sociopolitical situation.

The deputies formed a commission on the return of deported peoples—in 1941 50,000 Germans, and in 1944 165,000 Tatars, 14,700 Greeks, 12,400 Bulgarians, and 8,500 Armenians were deported—and they also drew up a short-term program for the resettlement of Crimean Tatars. The question of assigning to Crimean Tatar families lands occupied by them without authorization is being examined.

The session also addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet a statement "On the Need To Repeal the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 30 June 1945 'On the Transformation of the Crimean ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] into the Crimean Oblast Within the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]' and the RSFSR Law of 25 June 1946 'On the Elimination of the Chechen-Ingush ASSR and the Transformation of the Crimean ASSR into the Crimean Oblast.'" The statement notes that "the deportation from Crimea of Germans in 1941, and Crimean Tatars, Greeks, Armenians, and Bulgarians in 1944, was used as a reason for abolishing the autonomous republic and destroyed its harmonious ethnic unity that had taken shape over the centuries."

An organizational committee set up by the oblast soviet for the drafting of proposals on Crimea's future status is working in parallel. On behalf of the group on state-legal questions and scientific-methodological support for the determination of Crimea's status, its chairman, L. Grach, stated that "the group has come to the conclusion that Crimea's status must be changed and raised" since "today's structure with the oblast as an administrative-territorial unit" is restricting Crimea's development.

Chernigov Bans 'Destabilizing' Political Acts

LD2509162590 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Text] The Presidium of the Chernigov regional Soviet of People's Deputies approved a ban on the activities of political groups and public organizations which are destabilizing the political situation in the country. This is explained by the fact that leaflets with appeals to change the existing state system in the country are being circulated among residents of the region.

Ukraine 'People's Party' Holds Founding Congress

LD2509164690 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Text] A constituent congress of the People's Party of the Ukraine took place in Dnepropetrovsk. Taking part in its work were delegates from seven regions of the republic. The new party, after its rules and regulations, will be guided by a council of equal representatives which will be headed by people's deputy of the Ukraine from Dnepropetrovsk Leopold Tabulyanskiy.

Caucasus

Party Advocates 'Independent,' 'United' Armenia

LD2509180690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report by correspondent Karyun Khumaryan in Yerevan]

[Text] The Armenian Communist Party came to its routine congress in a state of profound ideological, political, and organizational crisis. As congress program documents note this is due to the general crisis in the totalitarian system.

Analyzing the present situation in the republic and the party Vladimir Movsisyan, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee first secretary, said that the Armenian Communist Party which has been the ruling party for decades has undoubteldy participated in all the achievements of Soviet Armenia, big and small, which have led it to the ranks of the developed Union republics. However, he stated that the Armenian Communist Party recognizes that having been an integral part of the CPSU it is responsible morally and politically for all the illegal actions directed against the people, the party, and any individuals and generally condemns those actions.

Impetuous events in the social and political life of the republic in the last years caused various movements in the party which have approached the congress with their own programs and regulations. This fact threatens a split in the party if not its disintegration. The present Armenian Communist Party Central Committee discussed the major points of the Armenian Communist Party program. The Armenian Communist Party, this documents says, decisively gives up the ossified ideas of the historical mission of the working class, the proletarian dictatorship, the necessity and inevitability of socialist revolutions, the ruling role of the Communist Party, the priority off international interests over national interests, and the anti-scientific practice of contrasting the interests of working people with the interests of all people.

The Armenian Communist Party advocates setting up an independent and united Armenia as its strategic goal. It believes that it is necessary for the Republic of Armenia to exist at the present stage in the history of the Armenian people as a part of the confederation of sovereign republics. The ultimate status of the party itself—whether it remains part of the CPSU or not—as well as the name of the party will be defined by the congress according to the program which is being suggested after the results of the all-party referendum on these issues are summarized. It is planned to hold a referendum during the congress break sometime in next several weeks.

Oleg Semonovich Shenin, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member CPSU Central Committee secretary, is taking part in the work of the congress. The congress will continue its work tomorrow.

Movsisyan Addresses Armenian Party Congress

LD2509131290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] A report from Yerevan: Among the issues being discussed by delegates to the Armenian Communist Party congress are an analysis of the current situation, the role and place of Communists in the sociopolitical life of the republic, and the causes for the exacerbation of interethnic relations in the region. The congress opened in Yerevan today.

Movsisyan, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the republican Communist Party Central Committee, delivered the political report of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Then debates began.

Future Shape, Role of Armenian Party Asserted

PM2509124390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent A. Sarkisyan: "Shape of Armenian Communist Party"]

[Text] It has to be acknowledged that since the defeat of the Communist Party representative in the election for the post of chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, many Communists have felt at a loss. What will be the future of gorkoms and raykoms [city and rayon party committees] in conditions where power will be held by other political organizations?

The following has been submitted to the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee for discussion by the republic's Communists.

"Attaching exceptional significance to the establishment of its autonomy, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee renounces political monopoly and management functions not specific to it and seeks to carry out its political aims under conditions of a multiparty system, operating within the framework of the republic Constitution. In its relations with the CPSU it will take decisions which do not run counter to the interests of the Armenian people. It will be governed by a national program, the underlying tasks of which are the achievement of national unity; deciding the political future of the Armenian people on the basis of self-determination; cooperation with its potential allies; the priority of common national values; and ensuring socioeconomic development, a high standard of living for the population, and the free development of national culture...."

The republic's Communists will struggle to create an independent, autonomous, rule-of-law state which will enter into treaty relations with all the subjects of the Soviet system under renewal and will establish its independent place in the international arena. At the same time the Armenian Communist Party, as the theses point out, will seek to lead the republic's sociopolitical life and promote its socioeconomic progress.

While honestly admitting and utterly condemning the mistakes committed in the past, the theses say that at the same time the Armenian Communist Party resolutely rejects the unjust attacks made on the party aimed at heaping blame upon honest Communists of both past and present generations.

Armenian Villages Calm Despite Azeri Threat

NC2509181390 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1800 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Excerpts] Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, received a cable from Khanlarskiy Rayon's Getashen village. This village was part of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] before being forcibly annexed to Azerbaijan [passage omitted]

We do not know what reply the Armenian President Levon Ter-Petrosyan has given to the people of Getashen. However, we are sure that our newly elected parliament must have sent a strong protest note to the USSR Government and to President Gorbachev personally because temporary calm prevails in Getashen and Martunashen after the three-day deadline [given by Azerbaijanis for the evacuation of the villages] expired.

Yet this calm is temporary because one can never trust the Azerbaijanis. Considering that they have issued such an ultimatum and are determined to expel the Armenian residents of Getashen and Martunashen from their native lands, it cannot be ruled out that some impediment might cause them to try some new satanic ploy despite the temporary frustration of their fury. This is evinced by their two-year policy towards the Armenians living in the Armenian regions in Azerbaijan.

However, the Azerbaijanis are also aware that it is not easy to settle accounts with Armenians. Neither threats nor the promised millions of rubles could force the Armenians to leave their millennium-old hearths and lands where their ancestors lived.

Azerbaijan is daily tightening the blockade around Artsakh [NKAO], Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, and Getashen Subrayon. The scoundrels of the Azerbaijani National Front dressed in militia uniforms and armed to the teeth are (?gathering) in the Turkish villages in NKAO with the intent of launching an aggression. In response, the Armenians of Artsakh declared that they would take similar measures for an appropriate counterblow in case of an armed clash.

Despite this explosive and tense situation frought with unforeseeable consequences, the center persists in disregarding the lawless and savage attitude of the Azerbaijanis.

24-Hour Strike Takes Place in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD2509122190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Stepanakert, 25 Sep (TASS)—An act of civil disobedience and a 24-hour strike took place today in the oblast and several rayon centers of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] in Azerbaijan, a Transcaucasian republic. The main demand of the demonstrators was the restoration of the oblast authorities in the oblast—which were dissolved in January last year—and support for a number of USSR people's deputies of the USSR, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Armenia who have declared a political hunger strike as a mark of their protest at the abolition of the oblast soviet of people's deputies and the party oblast committee.

An appeal has been sent to USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev demanding the restoration of constitutional power in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast. The act was peaceable. Servicemen of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, who are exercising an emergency situation regime in Nagorno-Karabakh and adjacent rayons of Azerbaijan, also showed restraint. In the afternoon the demonstrators dispersed. All enterprises in the oblast will resume work tomorrow.

Azeri Trade Unions Abolish NKAO Council

NC2509122290 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Excerpts] The Azerbaijani trade unions council finally woke up from its long sleep. The Armenian population of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] was wondering why Azerbaijan has delayed for so long its abolition of the oblast trade unions council. Afterall the party, soviet, and komsomol organs of the neighboring republic had long since abolished their oblast branches. [passage omitted]

At the end of last week the leadership of the Azerbaijani trade unions council decided on paper to terminate the functions of the NKAO oblast trade unions council on the pretext that the latter is engaged in calculated acts which endanger trade union solidarity, inflame interethnic alienation and enmity in the region, and undermine the territorial integrity of the republic. It also decided to remove Sergey Davityan from his post as chairman of the oblast trade unions council.

We think that the oblast trade unions council must be thankful to the Azerbaijani trade unions council for this constructive move that gives independence to the NKAO trade unions council which toward the end of 1988 had already left the Azerbaijani trade unions council. (?Aga Guseynov), chairman of the trade unions council of the neighboring republic, was right in saying at the latest plenum of the Azerbaijani trade unions council that the trade unions are now searching for their niche in the processes of restructuring. Apparently, this is happening now.

Baku Non-Residents Ordered Out of City

PM2509213990 Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 Sep 90 p 1

[POSTFAKTUM report: "No Residence Permit—Get Out!"]

[Text] Colonel Valeriy Buniyatov, military commandant of Baku City, spoke on republican television.

He announced that tension is rising in the city in connection with the approaching elections to the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet. Buniyatov demanded that persons without Baku residence permits should leave the city's territory by 0900 hours 26 September. The order will remain in force until 2 October this year.

All republican ministries and departments have been instructed to refrain from inviting official visitors.

Central Asia

Kazakhstan Leader Discusses 'Alarming Trends'

LD2509220990 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1400 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] A regular press conference for journalists of the central and republican mass media was held at the press center of Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee on 24 September. It was devoted to topical matters of sociopolitical life. Comrade Anufriyev, second secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee, stressed in his speech that the situation in the republic is characterized by a sharp growth in the politicization of the population. There are more than 100 parties and other public organizations and movements, in some cases with contradictory views. However the separatist tendencies that have emerged in recent years in certain regions of Kazakhstan, and the irresponsible appeals made by some groups aimed at division of the republican territory and thereby at exacerbating interethnic relations, are causing special alarm.

The position of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan Central Committee in bringing up this question to light is principled and unambiguous. The draft declaration of the state sovereignty of the republic is fully supported by the constitution—no one can violate the territory of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, and its boundaries can only be changed by mutual agreement with other republics.

The numerous questions raised by journalists were answered by Sultanov, head of the ideological department of the central committee; [name indistinct], secretary of East Kazakhstan Oblast Party Committee; and scientists Beldibayev, Grigoryev, and Vezhnanov.

Homemade Bomb Explodes at School in Alma-Ata

LD2509144890 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Gennadiy Isakov]

[Text] Alma-Ata September 25 TASS—The explosion of a home-made bomb in the foyer of a local school on the evening of September 13 continues to agitate the population of the Kazakh capital. In accordance with the legislation on languages recently adopted in the republic, another school with tuition in Kazakh was formed on the school's premises. In this connection someone decided to divide the foyer by a metallic fence, which has been exploded.

Moldakhmet Ashimov, chief of the department for the protection of public order, at the Interior Ministry agency at the Alma-Ata city executive committee, said that this was an act of vandalism of teenagers. He said there is no reason to explain this by the striving of some chauvinists to prevent Kazakhs from using their right of tuition in the native language.

Nevertheless, the event is used by extremist groups to stir up ethnic strife.

A rally was held in a square in front of the building of the Kazakh Academy of Sciences on Saturday. Several hundred people gathered for the rally. They were joined by a crowd of Kazakh youths who marched to the square through central streets of their city. The youths chanted nationalist slogans. Speakers at the rally demanded that people's deputies from the East-Kazakhstan region be expelled from Kazakhstan. Speakers also protested against the publication by the central press of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's article "How We Should Remake Russia." They believe it is provocative and makes claims to Kazakh territory.

Representatives of the protesters were received by staffers of the president's apparatus, by party and government officials of Kazakhstan. Mutual understanding has not been achieved, however.

To this day, classes have not been resumed in the school with tuition in Kazakh. Concerned parents demand that pupils' security be ensured. Studies were not disrupted in the Russian language school.

Kirghizia, Armenia Sign Cooperation Agreement

LD2609010190 Frunze Domestic Service in Kirghiz 1200 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Excerpts] An economic, scientific-technical, and cultural cooperation agreement to span 1991 to 1995 was signed between the governments of the Kirghiz Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Armenian Republic in Frunze. [passage omitted] Signing the agreement for the two sides were Begaliyev, chairman of the Kirghiz SSR State Planning Committee; (Shakhverdiyan), first deputy chairman of the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply of the Armenian republic, (Ruhsameniyan), deputy chairman of the State Planning Committee of the Armenian Republic; and other officials.